arXiv:1109.3807v2 [math.AP] 13 Oct 2011

REGULARITY RESULTS FOR FULLY NONLINEAR PARABOLIC INTEGRO-DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS

YONG-CHEOL KIM AND KI-AHM LEE

Abstract. In this paper, we consider the regularity theory for fully nonlinear parabolic integro-differential equations with symmetric kernels. We are able to find parabolic versions of Alexandro-Backelman-Pucci estimate with $0 < \sigma < 2$. And we show a Harnack inequality, Hölder regularity, and $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of the solutions by obtaining decay estimates of their level sets.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
1.1. Operators 2
1.2. Main equation 4
1.3. Known results and Key Observations 4
1.4. Outline of Paper 5
1.5. Notations 5
2. Preliminaries 6
3. A nonlocal Alexandroff-Bakelman-Pucci estimate 7
3.1. ε-envelope and Monge-Ampére measure 7
3.2. Concave envelope and normal map 8
3.3. Nonlocal Parabolic A-B-P estimate 10
4. Decay Estimate of Upper Level Sets 14
4.1. Special functions 15
4.2. Key Lemmas 19
4.3. Nonlocal Parabolic Calderón-Zygmund decomposition 21
4.4. Decay estimate through iterations 22
5. Regularity Theory 25
5.1. Hölder estimates 25
5.2. $C^{1,\alpha}$-estimates 28
5.3. Harnack inequality 29
References 31

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 47G20, 45K05, 35J60, 35B65, 35D10 (60J75).

1. Introduction

In this paper, we are going to find a parabolic version of Alexandro-Backelman-Pucci estimate, Harnack inequality, Hölder regularity, and $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity whose elliptic versions have been considered at [CS] with symmetric kernels and at [KL1, KL2] with nonsymmetric kernels. The concept of viscosity solutions and notations are parallel with those at [CS, KL1, KL2] with minor changes.

The linear *parabolic integro-differential operators* are given as

$$\mathcal{L}u(x,t)-\partial_t u(x,t)=\text{p.v.}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mu(u,x,y)K(y,t)\,dy-\partial_t u(x,t) \tag{1.0.1}$$

for $\mu(u,x,y,t)=u(x+y,t)-u(x,t)-(\nabla u(x,t)\cdot y)\chi_{B_1}(y)$, which describes the infinitesimal generator of given purely jump processes, i.e. processes without diffusion or drift part [CS]. We refer the detailed definitions of notations to [CS, KL1, KL2]. Then we see that $\mathcal{L}u(x,t)$ is well-defined provided that $u\in \mathrm{C}^{1,1}_x(x,t)\cap \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T])$ where $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T])$ denotes *the family of all real-valued bounded functions defined on* $\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]$ and $\mathrm{C}^{1,1}_x(x,t)$ means $C^{1,1}$-function at x for a given t. If K is symmetric (i.e. $K(-y,t)=K(y,t)$), then an odd function $\Big[(\nabla u(x,t)\cdot y)\chi_{B_1}(y)\Big]K(y,t)$ will be canceled in the integral, and so we have that

$$\mathcal{L}u(x,t)=\text{p.v.}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\Big[u(x+y,t)+u(x-y,t)-2u(x,t)\Big]K(y,t)\,dy.$$

Nonlinear integro-differential operators come from the stochastic control theory related with

$$\mathcal{I}u(x,t)=\sup_\alpha \mathcal{L}_\alpha u(x,t),$$

or game theory associated with

$$\mathcal{I}u(x,t)=\inf_\beta\sup_\alpha \mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}u(x,t), \tag{1.0.2}$$

when the stochastic process is of Lèvy type allowing jumps; see [S, CS, KL1]. Also an operator like $\mathcal{I}u(x,t)=\sup_\alpha\inf_\beta\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}u(x,t)$ can be considered. Characteristic properties of these operators can easily be derived as follows;

$$\inf_{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}v(x,t)\le \mathcal{I}[u+v](x,t)-\mathcal{I}u(x,t)\le\sup_{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}v(x,t). \tag{1.0.3}$$

1.1. **Operators.** In this section, we introduce a class of operators. All notations and the concepts of viscosity solution follow [CS] with minor changes.

For parabolic setting and our purpose, we shall consider functions $u(x,t)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}^n\times[0,T]$ and restrict our attention to the operators $\mathcal{L}$ where the measure is given by a positive kernel K which is symmetric. That is to say, the operators $\mathcal{L}$ are given by

$$\mathcal{L}u(x,t)=\text{p.v.}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mu(u,x,y,t)K(y,t)\,dy \tag{1.1.1}$$

where $\mu(u,x,y,t) = u(x+y,t) + u(x-y,t) - 2u(x,t)$. And we consider the class $\mathfrak{L}$ of the operators $\mathcal{L}$ associated with positive kernels $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$ satisfying that

$$(1.1.2) \qquad (2-\sigma)\frac{\lambda}{|y|^{n+\sigma}} \leq K(y,t) \leq (2-\sigma)\frac{\Lambda}{|y|^{n+\sigma}},\ 0 < \sigma < 2.$$

The maximal operator and the minimal operator with respect to $\mathfrak{L}$ are defined by

$$(1.1.3) \qquad \mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u(x,t) = \sup_{\mathcal{L}\in\mathfrak{L}} \mathcal{L}u(x,t) \text{ and } \mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u(x,t) = \inf_{\mathcal{L}\in\mathfrak{L}} \mathcal{L}u(x,t).$$

In what follows, we let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded open domain, $I = (\tau_1, \tau_2]$ be a bounded half-open interval where $\tau_1 < -100$ and $\tau_2 > 100$, and $J = (a,b] \subseteq I$. For $(x,t) \in \Omega_J \fallingdotseq \Omega \times J$ and a function $u : \mathbb{R}^n \times I \to \mathbb{R}$ which is semicontinuous on $\overline{\Omega}_J$, we say that φ belongs to the function class $C^2_{\Omega_J}(u;x,t)^+$ (resp. $C^2_{\Omega_J}(u;x,t)^-$) and we write $\varphi \in C^2_{\Omega_J}(u;x,t)^+$ (resp. $\varphi \in C^2_{\Omega_J}(u;x,t)^-$) if there exists a $U_{t,\delta}$ such that $\varphi(x,t) = u(x,t)$ and $\varphi > u$ (resp. $\varphi < u$) on $U_{t,\delta} \setminus \{(x,t)\}$ for some open neighborhood $U \subset \Omega$ of x and some $(t-\delta, t] \subset J$, where $U_{t,\delta} = U \times (t-\delta, t]$. We note that geometrically $u - \varphi$ having a local maximum at (x,t) in Ω_J is equivalent to $\varphi \in C^2_{\Omega_J}(u;x,t)^+$ and $u-\varphi$ having a local minimum at (x,t) in Ω_J is equivalent to $\varphi \in C^2_{\Omega_J}(u;x,t)^-$. And the expression for $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}\, u(x,t)$ and $\mathcal{I}u(x,t)$ may be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}\, u(x,t) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu(u,x,y,t) K_{\alpha\beta}(y,t)\, dy, \\ \mathcal{I}u(x,t) &= \inf_{\beta} \sup_{\alpha} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha\beta}\, u(x,t), \end{aligned}$$

where $K_{\alpha\beta} \in \mathcal{K}_0$. Then we see $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u(x,t) \leq \mathcal{I}u(x,t) \leq \mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u(x,t)$, and $\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u(x,t)$ and $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u(x,t)$ have the following simple forms;

$$(1.1.4) \qquad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u(x,t) &= (2-\sigma) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\Lambda\mu^+(u,x,y,t) - \lambda\mu^-(u,x,y,t)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\, dy, \\ \mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u(x,t) &= (2-\sigma) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\lambda\mu^+(u,x,y,t) - \Lambda\mu^-(u,x,y,t)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\, dy, \end{aligned}$$

where μ^+ and μ^- are given by

$$\mu^\pm(u,x,y,t) = \max\{\pm\mu(u,x,y,t), 0\}.$$

A function $u : \mathbb{R}^n \times I \to \mathbb{R}$ is said to be $C^{1,1}_{x,\pm}$ at $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times I$ (we write $u \in C^{1,1}_{x,\pm}(x,t)$), if there are $r_0 > 0$ and $M > 0$ (independent of s) such that

$$(1.1.5) \qquad \pm\,(u(x+y,t) + u(x-y,t) - 2u(x,t)) \leq M\,|y|^2$$

for any $(y,s) \in B_{r_0}(0) \times (-r_0, 0]$.

We write $u \in C^{1,1}_{x,\pm}(U_t)$ if $u \in C^{1,1}_{x,\pm}(x,t)$ for any $(x,t) \in U_t$ and the constant M in (1.1.5) is independent of (x,t), where $U_t = U \times (t-\delta, t] \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times I$ for some $\delta >$

0 for an open subset U of $\mathbb{R}^n$. And we denote $C^{1,1}_x(x,t) = C^{1,1}_{x,+}(x,t) \cap C^{1,1}_{x,-}(x,t)$, $C^{1,1}_x(U_t) = C^{1,1}_{x,+}(U_t) \cap C^{1,1}_{x,-}(U_t)$, and $C^{1,1}(U_t) = C^{1,1}_{x,}(U_t) \cup C^{0,1}_t(U_t)$.

We note that if $u \in C^{1,1}_x(x,t)$, then $\mathcal{I}u(x,t)$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\pm}_{\mathfrak{L}}u(x,t)$ will be well-defined. We shall use these maximal and minimal operators to obtain regularity estimates.

Let $K(x,t) = \sup_\alpha K_\alpha(x,t)$ where K_α's are all the kernels of all operators in a class $\mathfrak{L}$. For any class $\mathfrak{L}$, we shall assume that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (|y|^2 \wedge 1)\, K(y,t)\, dy < \infty. \tag{1.1.6}$$

The following is a kind of operators of which the regularity result shall be obtained in this paper.

Definition 1.1.1. *Let $\mathfrak{L}$ be a class of linear integro-differential operators. Assume that* (1.1.6) *holds for $\mathfrak{L}$. Then we say that an operator $\mathcal{J}$ is elliptic with respect to $\mathfrak{L}$, if it satisfies the following properties:*

(a) $\mathcal{J}u(x,t)$ is well-defined for any $u \in C^{1,1}_x(x,t) \cap B(\mathbb{R}^n \times t)$.

(b) $\mathcal{J}u$ is continuous on an open $\Omega_J \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times I$, whenever $u \in C^{1,1}_x(\Omega_J) \cap B(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)$.

(c) If $u, v \in C^{1,1}_x(x,t) \cap B(\mathbb{R}^n \times t)$, then we have that

$$\mathcal{M}^{-}_{\mathfrak{L}}[u-v](x,t) \le \mathcal{J}u(x,t) - \mathcal{J}v(x,t) \le \mathcal{M}^{+}_{\mathfrak{L}}[u-v](x,t). \tag{1.1.7}$$

The concept of viscosity solutions, its comparison principle and stability properties can be obtained with small modifications from [CS] as [W1]. We summarized them at section 2.

1.2. **Main equation.** The natural Dirichlet problem for such parabolic nonlocal operator $\mathcal{I}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T]$ is given as the following. Given functions φ and g defined on $(\mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T]) \setminus (\Omega \times (0,T])$ and Ω respectively, we want to find a function u such that

$$\begin{cases} u_t(x,t) - \mathcal{I}u(x,t) = 0 & \text{for any } (x,t) \in \Omega \times (0,T], \\ u(x,t) = \varphi(x,t) & \text{for } (x,t) \in (\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,T]) \setminus (\Omega \times [0,T]). \\ u(x,0) = g(x) & \text{for } x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.2.1}$$

Note that the boundary condition is given not only on $\partial_p(\Omega \times (0,T])$ but also on the whole complement of $(\Omega \times (0,T])$. This is because of the nonlocal character of the operator $\mathcal{I}$. From the stochastic point of view, it corresponds to the fact that a discontinuous Lèvy process can exit the domain $(\Omega \times (0,T])$ for the first time jumping to any point in $(\mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T]) \setminus (\Omega \times (0,T])$.

In this paper, we shall concentrate mainly upon the regularity properties of viscosity solutions to an equation $u_t(x,t) - \mathcal{I}u(x,t) = 0$.

1.3. **Known results and Key Observations.** There are some known results about Harnack inequalities and Hölder estimates for integro-differential operators with positive symmetric kernels (see [J] for analytical proofs and [BBC], [BK1], [BK2],[BL], [KS], [SV] for probabilistic proofs). More general results for the elliptic cases have been shown[CS]) for symmetric kernels and [KL1, KL2] for nonsymmetric kernels. The analytic approach for the linear parabolic equations can be found at [CV].

There are some serious difficulties arises when we try to extend the results in elliptic case to the parabolic equations. Key observations are the following:

• The equation is local in time while it is nonlocal in the space variable. Caffarelli and Silvestre considered a sequence of dyadic rings in space at A-B-P estimate to find the balance of quantities in the integral. But a simple generalization of the ring in space to one in space-time fails since the equation is local in the time variable. Such unbalance between local and nonlocal terms in the equation requires more fine analysis to find a parabolic version of A-B-P estimate at section 3.

• There is a time delay to control the lower bound in a small neighborhood of a point by the current value at the point, which is a main difference between elliptic and parabolic equations. Such time-delay effect has been shown at Lemma 4.2.1 with a parabolic A-B-P estimate and a barrier, Lemma 4.1.3. And we also need a parabolic version of Calderon-Zygmund decomposition which has been considered at [W1].

1.4. **Outline of Paper.** In Section 3, we show nonlocal versions of the parabolic nonlocal Alexandroff-Backelman-Pucci estimate to handle the difficulties caused by the locality in the time varibale. In Section 4, we construct a special function and apply a parabolic version of A-B-P estimates to obtain the decay estimates of upper level sets which is essential in proving Hölder estimates in Section 5.

In Section 5, we prove the Hölder estimates and an interior $C^{1,\alpha}$-estimates come from the arguments at [CS, KL1, KL2]. We also show a Harnack inequality.

1.5. **Notations.** We summarize the notations of domains briefly for the reader's convenience.

(1) $\partial_p(\Omega \times J) = \partial\Omega \times J \bigcup \overline{\Omega} \times \{a\}$. $\partial^*_p(\Omega \times J) = (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega) \times J \bigcup \mathbb{R}^n \times \{a\}$.
(2) $Q_r = B_r(0) \times (-r^\sigma, 0]$, $Q_r(x,t) = Q_r + (x,t)$, and $Q = Q_1(0,1)$, $Q_r^- = Q_r(0,r^\sigma)$, $Q_r^+ = Q_r(x,t)$.
(3) $\mathrm{Q}_1 \fallingdotseq Q = B_1 \times (0,1]$, $\mathrm{Q}_r \fallingdotseq Q_r(0,r^\sigma) = B_r \times (0, r^\sigma]$, $\mathrm{Q}_r^- \fallingdotseq \mathrm{Q}_r + (0, r^\sigma) = B_r \times (r^\sigma, 2r^\sigma)$, $\mathrm{Q}_r^+ \fallingdotseq \mathrm{Q}_r^- + (0, 2r^\sigma) = B_r \times (3r^\sigma, 4r^\sigma)$, $\mathrm{Q}_r(x_0,t_0) = \mathrm{Q}_r + (x_0,t_0)$ and $\mathrm{B}_r^{\mathrm{d}}(x_0,t_0) = \{(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times I : \mathrm{d}\big((x,t),(x_0,t_0)\big) < r\}$ are defined at Section 4.4
(4) $\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_r \fallingdotseq \mathrm{Q}_r \cup Q_r = B_r \times (-r^\sigma, r^\sigma]$ and $\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_r(x_0,t_0) = \bar{\mathrm{Q}}_r + (x_0,t_0)$ are defined at Section 5.2.
(5) $K_r = (-r,r)^n \times (-r^2, 0]$ and $K_r(x,t) = K_r + (x,t)$.
(6) $\mathrm{K}_r = (-r,r)^n \times (-r^\sigma, 0]$, $\mathrm{K}_r(x,t) = \mathrm{K}_r + (x,t)$, $\mathrm{K}_r^- = \mathrm{K}_r(0,r^\sigma)$, $\mathrm{K}_{3r}^+ = (-3r,3r)^n \times (r^\sigma, (3^\sigma+2)r^\sigma]$, $\mathrm{K}_r^-(x,t) = \mathrm{K}_r^- + (x,t)$, and $\mathrm{K}_{3r}^+(x,t) = \mathrm{K}_{3r}^+ + (x,t)$.
(7) $\mathcal{G}_h^u$ and $\mathcal{B}_s^u$ are defined at Section 4.2.

(8) $\overline{\mathrm{K}}^m$, $\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^m$, $\mathcal{A}^m_\delta$, and $\mathfrak{B}^m_\delta$ are defined at Section 4.3.

2. PRELIMINARIES

The parabolic distance for $P_1 = (x,t)$ and $P_2 = (y,s)$ is defined to be

$$d(P_1,P_2) = \begin{cases} (|x-y|^\sigma + |t-s|)^{1/\sigma}, & t \le s, \\ \infty, & t > s. \end{cases} \tag{2.0.1}$$

We define the parabolic boundary of $\Omega \times J$ by $\partial_p \Omega \times J = \partial\Omega \times J \bigcup \overline{\Omega} \times \{a\}$. For $r > 0$, we set $Q_r(x,t) = B_r(x) \times (t - r^\sigma, t]$ and $Q^c_r(x,t) = (\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r(x)) \times (t - r^\sigma, t]$. We also define the diameter d of $Q_r(x,t)$ by $d = \sqrt{5}\, r$.

Definition 2.0.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times I \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. Then a function $u : \mathbb{R}^n \times I \to \mathbb{R}$ which is upper (lower) semicontinuous on $\overline{\Omega} \times J$ is said to be a viscosity subsolution (viscosity supersolution) of an equation $u_t - \mathcal{J}u = f$ on $\Omega \times J$ and we write $u_t - \mathcal{J}u \le f$ ($u_t - \mathcal{J}u \ge f$) on $\Omega \times J$ in the viscosity sense, if for any $(x,t) \in \Omega \times J$ there is some neighborhood $Q_r(x,t) \subset \Omega \times J$ of (x,t) such that $u_t(x,t) - \mathcal{J}u(x,t)$ is well-defined and $\varphi_t(x,t) - \mathcal{J}v(x,t) \le f(x,t)$ ($\varphi_t(x,t) - \mathcal{J}v(x,t) \ge f(x,t)$) for $v = \varphi\chi_{Q_r(x,t)} + u\chi_{Q^c_r(x,t)}$ whenever $\varphi \in C^2(Q_r(x,t))$ with $\varphi(x,t) = u(x,t)$ and $\varphi > u$ ($\varphi < u$) on $Q_r(x,t) \setminus \{(x,t)\}$ exists. Also a function uis called as a viscosity solution if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution to $u_t - \mathcal{J}u = f$ on $\Omega \times J$.*

Theorem 2.0.2. *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times I \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function. Then we have the followings:*

(a) If $u : \mathbb{R}^n \times I \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function which is upper semicontinuous on $\overline{\Omega} \times J$, then $u_t - \mathcal{I}u \le f$ on $\Omega \times J$ in the viscosity sense if and only if $\varphi_t(x,t) - \mathcal{I}u(x,t)$ is well-defined and

$$\varphi_t(x,t) - \mathcal{I}u(x,t) \le f(x,t) \quad \text{for any } (x,t) \in \Omega \times J \text{ and } \varphi \in C^2_{\Omega\times J}(u;x,t)^+. \tag{2.0.2}$$

(b) If $u : \mathbb{R}^n \times I \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function which is lower semicontinuous on $\overline{\Omega} \times J$, then $u_t - \mathcal{I}u \ge f$ on $\Omega \times J$ in the viscosity sense if and only if $\varphi_t(x,t) - \mathcal{I}u(x,t)$ is well-defined and

$$\varphi_t(x,t) - \mathcal{I}u(x,t) \ge f(x,t) \quad \text{for any } (x,t) \in \Omega \times J \text{ and } \varphi \in C^2_{\Omega\times J}(u;x,t)^-. \tag{2.0.3}$$

(c) If $u : \mathbb{R}^n \times I \to \mathbb{R}$ is a function which is continuous on $\overline{\Omega}$, then u is a viscosity solution to $u_t - \mathcal{I}u = f$ on $\Omega \times J$ if and only if it satisfies both (2.0.2) *and* (2.0.3).

Proof. Refer to [CS, KL1]. □

The following comparison principle and stability of viscosity solutions come from [CS] with minor changes as [W1].

Theorem 2.0.3. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and let $\mathcal{J}$ be elliptic with respect to a class $\mathfrak{L}$ in Definition 1.1.1. If $u \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times J)$ is a viscosity subsolution to $\mathcal{J}u - u_t \ge f$ on $\Omega \times J$, $v \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times J)$ is a viscosity supersolution to $\mathcal{J}v - v_t \le f$ on $\Omega \times J$ and $u \le v$ on $(\mathbb{R}^n \times (0,T] \setminus \Omega \times J) \cup (\mathbb{R}^n \times \{0\})$, then $u \le v$ on $\Omega \times J$.*

Theorem 2.0.4. *Let* Ω *be a bounded domain in* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *and let* $\mathcal{J}$ *be elliptic with respect to a class* $\mathfrak{L}$ *as in Definition 1.1.1. If* $u \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)$ *is a viscosity subsolution to* $\mathcal{J}u - u_t \geq f$ *on* $\Omega \times J$ *and* $v \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)$ *is a viscosity supersolution to* $\mathcal{J}v - v_t \leq g$ *on* $\Omega \times J$ *where* $\Omega \times J = \Omega \times J \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times I$*, then* $\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}}[u - v] - (u_t - v_t) \geq f - g$ *on* $\Omega \times J$ *in the viscosity sense.*

Theorem 2.0.5. *Let* $\mathcal{J}$ *be elliptic as Definition 1.1.1. If* $\{u_k\} \subset \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times J)$ *is a sequence of viscosity solutions to* $\mathcal{J}u_k - \partial_t u_k = f_k$ *on* $\Omega \times J$ *such that*

(*a*) $\{u_k\}$ *and* $\{f_k\}$ *converge to* u *and* f *locally uniformly on* $\Omega \times J$*, respectively,*

(*b*) $\{u_k\}$ *converges to* u a.e. *on* $\mathbb{R}^n \times J$*,*

then u *is a viscosity solution to* $\mathcal{J}u - \partial_t u = f$ *on* $\Omega \times J$*.*

3. A nonlocal Alexandroff-Bakelman-Pucci estimate

3.1. **ε-envelope and Monge-Ampére measure.** We employ the concept of ε-envelope given at [W1].

Definition 3.1.1. (*i*) *Define the Minkowski sum* $A + B$ *of two sets* A *and* B *in* $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ *as* $A + B = \{x + y : x \in A, y \in B\}$.

(*ii*) *Set* $\{0\}^\varepsilon := \{(x, t, z) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} : |x|^2 - t + |z|^2 \leq \varepsilon^2 \text{ for } t \leq 0\}$ *and* $A^\varepsilon := A + \{0\}^\varepsilon$.

(*iii*) *For* $G(u) := \{(x, t, z) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} : z \leq u(x, t)\}$*, we define the upper* ε*-envelope of* u *as* $u^\varepsilon(x, t) = \sup\{u : (x, t, z) \in G(u)^\varepsilon\}$ *and lower* ε*-envelope of* u *as* $u_\varepsilon = -(-u)^\varepsilon$.

Then it has the following properties.

Lemma 3.1.2 ([W1])**.** *Let* u *be a viscosity solution of* $u_t = \mathcal{I}[u]$ *for* $\mathcal{I} \in \mathfrak{L}$*. Then we have the following properties;*

(*i*) $u^\varepsilon \in C(D)$ *and* $u^\varepsilon \downarrow u$ *uniformly in* D *as* $\varepsilon \to 0$.

(*ii*) u^ε *is a viscosity subsolution.*

(*iii*) *For any* $(x_0, t_0) \in D$*, there is a concave parabolic paraboloid of opening* $2/\varepsilon$ *that touches* u^ε *at* (x_0, t_0) *from below in* D*. So* u^ε *is* $C^{1,1}$ *by below in* D*. In particular, the lower bounds of* $D^2_x u^\varepsilon$ *and* $-u^\varepsilon_t$ *are well defined in* D *and* $u^\varepsilon \in C^{1,1}_{x,-}(x, t) \cap C^{0,1}_t(x, t)$ *a.e. in* D*.*

Definition 3.1.3. *Let* u *be a convex function in* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$*. Then the* Monge-Amphère *measure* M_u *corresponding to the function* u *is defined as*

$$M_u(A) = \int_A \det(D^2 u)\, dx$$

for a subset $A \subset \Omega$*.*

Lemma 3.1.4 (Chapter VII,[D])**.** *Let* u_k *be convex functions satisfying* $u_k \to u$ *pointwise in a convex domain* Ω *and let* $A_k \to A$ *as* $k \to \infty$ *where* A_k*'s and* A *are bounded closed subsets of* Ω*. Then we have that*

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} M_{u_k}(A_k) \leq M_u(A)$$

and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_\Omega f\,dM_{u_k}=\int_\Omega f\,dM_u$$

for $f\in C^0_c(\Omega)$.

3.2. **Concave envelope and normal map.** We now define concave envelopes of a function u defined on $\mathbb{R}^n\times I$ and furnish their properties below. For $r>0$, we set $Q_r=Q_r(0,0)$.

Definition 3.2.1. *Let* $u:\mathbb{R}^n\times I\to\mathbb{R}$ *be a function which is not positive on* $\partial^*_pQ_{r/2}$ *and is upper semicontinuous on* $\overline{Q}_r$.

(i) $u(x,t)$ *is called concave in* $\mathbb{R}^n\times I$ *if* $u(x,t)$ *is concave in* x *and nondecreasing in* t.

(ii) *The concave envelope* $\Gamma(y,s)$ *of* u *in* Q_{2r} *is defined as*

$$\Gamma(y,s)=\begin{cases}\inf\{v(y,s):v\in\Pi,\ v>u^+\ \textit{in}\ Q_{2r}\} & \textit{in}\ Q_{2r}\\ 0 & \textit{in}\ \partial^*_pQ_{2r},\end{cases}$$

where Π *is the family of all concave functions* v *in* Q_{2r} *such that* $v\le 0$ *on* ∂_pQ_{2r}.

(iii) *The normal map* $\mathfrak{N}_u$ *of* $u:Q\to\mathbb{R}$ *is given by*

(3.2.1)
$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{N}_u(x,t)=\{(p,h)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times(\tau_1,t]:u(y,s)\le u(x,t)+p\cdot(y-x),\ \forall(y,s)\in Q,\\ \text{and } u(x,t)-p\cdot x=h\}\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.2.2 (Chapter VII,[D]). *Let* $u:\mathbb{R}^n\times I\to\mathbb{R}$ *be a function which is not positive on* $\partial^*_pQ_{r/2}$ *and is upper semicontinuous on* $\overline{Q}_r$. *Then we have the followings;*

(i) *if* $u\in C(\overline{Q}_r)$, *then its concave envelope* Γ *is nondecreasing in* t *and* $\Gamma\in C(\overline{Q}_r)$.

(ii) *if* $u\in Lip(\overline{Q}_r)$, *then* $\Gamma\in Lip(\overline{Q}_r)$ *and* $\|\Gamma\|_{Lip(\overline{Q}_r)}\le(n+1)\|u\|_{Lip(\overline{Q}_r)}$.

Lemma 3.2.3. *Let* Γ *be concave in* Q_1 *and* $\Gamma=0$ *on* ∂_pQ_1. *Set* C *to be the support of* $\det(D^2\Gamma)$. *Then we have the following results;*

(i) *if* $0\le\Gamma_t\le M$ *on* C, *then* $0\le\Gamma_t\le 2M$ *on* $\overline{Q}_1$.

(ii) *for any* $(x,t)\in Q_1\cap C$, *we have that*

$$0\le\sup_{B_r(x)}\Gamma_t(y,t)\le\left((1-cr)\sup_{B_r(x,t)\cap C}\Gamma_t(y,t)+\frac{1}{c}\,r\sup_{Q_1}\Gamma_t(y,s)\right)\ \textit{on}\ \overline{Q}_1$$

for some uniform constant $c>0$.

Proof. (i) Take any point $(x_0,t_0)\in Q_1\setminus C$. Then there are some $(x_i,t_0)\in C$ ($i=1,\cdots,n+1$) such that

$$\Gamma(x_0,t_0)=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1}\lambda_i\Gamma(x_i,t_0).$$

From the assumption, there is some $\delta\in(0,1)$ such that

$$\Gamma(x_i,t)\ge\Gamma(x_i,t_0)+2M(t-t_0)$$

for $t_0 - \delta \leq t \leq t_0$. Set $\tilde{\Gamma}$ to be the smallest concave function in $Q = \{(x,t) \in Q_R : t_0 - \delta \leq t \leq t_0\}$ such that $\tilde{\Gamma} = 0$ on $\partial_p Q$ and

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(x_i, t) \geq \Gamma(x_i, t_0) + 2M(t - t_0)$$

for $t_0 - \delta \leq t \leq t_0$. Since $\Gamma(x_i, t) \geq \Gamma(x_i, t_0) + 2M(t - t_0)$, $\Gamma(x,t) \geq \tilde{\Gamma}(x,t)$ in Q and $\Gamma(x_0, t_0) = \tilde{\Gamma}(x_0, t_0)$ from the definition of $\tilde{\Gamma}(x,t)$. Therefore $\Gamma_t(x_0, t_0) \leq \tilde{\Gamma}_t(x_0, t_0) \leq 2M$. And from the definition of concavity of Γ in a parabolic domain and Definition 3.2.1, we see that Γ is nonincreasing. So we have that $\Gamma_t \geq 0$.

(ii) From the argument in (i), for any point $(x_0, t) \in (B_r(x) \times \{t\}) \setminus C$, there are $(x_i, t) \in C$ $(i = 1, \cdots, n+1)$ such that $\Gamma(x_0, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_i \Gamma(x_i, t)$ and $\partial_t \Gamma(x_0, t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \lambda_i \partial_t \Gamma(x_i, t)$. In addition, there is some $x_k \in B_r(x) \cap C$ and $c \in (0,1)$ such that

$$cr < 1 - \lambda_k < \frac{r}{c}$$

from the convexity of Γ since $x \in B_r(x) \cap C$. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \Gamma(x_0, t) &\leq \lambda_k \partial_t \Gamma(x_k, t) + \sum_{i \neq k} \lambda_i \partial_t \Gamma(x_i, t) \\ &\leq \left((1 - cr) \sup_{y \in B_r(x) \cap C} \partial_t \Gamma(y, t) + \frac{1}{c} r \sup_{Q_1} \partial_t \Gamma \right) \end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$.

□

Lemma 3.2.4. *(i) If v is strictly convex and smooth, then we have that $\nabla_i \left(\det(D^2 v(x,t)) v^{ij} \right) = 0$ where (v^{ij}) is the inverse of (v_{ij}).*

(ii) If $v \in C^{2,1}(\overline{Q}_r(x_0, t_0))$ is concave in x and increasing in t and if $v = 0$ on $\partial_p Q_r(x_0, t_0)$, then we have that

(*a*)
$$\int_{B_r(x_0)} v(x, t_0) \det(D^2 v(x, t_0)) dx = (n+1) \int_{Q_r(x_0, t_0)} \partial_t v(x,t) \det(D^2 v(x,t)) dx dt,$$

(*b*)
$$\mathfrak{R}_v(Q_r) = \int_{Q_r} \partial_t v(x,t) \det(D^2 v(x,t))^- dx dt,$$

(*c*)
$$\max_{x \in B_r} v(x, t_0) \leq Cr \left(\mathfrak{R}_v(Q_r(x_0, t_0)) \right)^{\frac{1}{n+1}}.$$

Proof. (i) Set $K = \det(D^2 v)$. By taking a derivative of $K\delta_i^j = K v^{jk} v_{ki}$ in the direction e_j, we have $K u^{mn} v_{mnj} \delta_i^j = (K v^{jk})_j v_{ki} + K v^{jk} v_{kij}$, which implies $(K v^{jk})_j v_{ki} = 0$. Now we show $0 = (K v^{jk})_j v_{ki} v^{il} = (K v^{jk})_j \delta_k^l = (K v^{jl})_j$.

(ii-(a)) For readers, we are going to show (b) when v is smooth and strictly convex. The general case can be proved by approximation, Theorem 22, [D].

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{B_r(x_0)} & v(x,t)\det(D^2v(x,t)dx \\ &= \int_{B_r(x_0)} v_t\det(D^2v)dx + \int_{B_r(x_0)} v\det(D^2v)v^{ij}v_{t,ij}dx.\end{aligned}$$

By taking an integration by part at i, j variables and applying (i), we can show

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_r(x_0)} v\det(D^2v)v^{ij}v_{t,ij} &= \int_{B_r(x_0)} v\det(D^2v)v^{ij}v_{t,ij} \\ = \int_{B_r(x_0)} v_t\det(D^2v)v^{ij}v_{ij} &= n\int_{B_r(x_0)} v_t\det(D^2v)dx\end{aligned}$$

and then

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{B_r(x_0)} v(x,t)\det(D^2v(x,t)dx = (n+1)\int_{B_r(x_0)} v_t\det(D^2v)dx.$$

Taking an integration in t on $(t_0-r,t_0]$, we get the conclusion.

(ii-(b)) It comes from [T].

(ii-(c)) The proof of (c) can be found at Theorem 22, Chapter VII,[D]. The idea is the following. First choose a concave cone $\tilde\Gamma$ in $Q_{2r}(x_0,t_0)$ whose vertex is $\max_{B_r} v(x,t_0)$ and $\operatorname{supp}\tilde\Gamma = Q_{2r}(x_0,t_0)$. Then $\mathfrak{N}_{\tilde\Gamma}(Q_r(x_0,t_0)) \leq \mathfrak{N}_v(Q_r(x_0,t_0))$. Since $\operatorname{supp}\det(D^2\tilde\Gamma)$ is the maximum point, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{\max_{B_r} v(x,t_0)}{r}\right)^{n+1} &\leq C(n+1)\int_{B_r(x_0)} (\tilde\Gamma(x,t_0))\det(D^2\tilde\Gamma(x,t_0)dx \\ &= C(n+1)\,\mathfrak{N}_{\tilde\Gamma}(Q_r(x_0,t_0)).\end{aligned}$$

□

3.3. **Nonlocal Parabolic A-B-P estimate.**

Lemma 3.3.1. *Let $0<\sigma<2$ be given. Let $u\leq 0$ in $\partial_p^* Q_{1/2}$ and let Γ be its concave envelope in Q_2. If $u\in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n\times I)$ is a viscosity subsolution to $\mathcal{M}^+_{\varrho}u - u_t = -f$ in Q_1 where $f:\mathbb{R}^n\times I\to\mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function with $f>0$ on $C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$, then there exists some constant $C>0$ depending only on n, λ and Λ (but not on σ) such that for any $(x,t)\in C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$ and any $\varrho, M>0$ there is some $k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$ such that*

(3.3.1)
$$\left|\{y\in R_k : u(x+y,t)-u(x,t)-(\nabla_x\varphi(x,t)\cdot y)\chi_{B_1}(y)\geq M\,r_k^2\}\right| \leq C\,\frac{f(x,t)}{M}\,|R_k|$$

where $R_k = B_{r_k}\setminus B_{r_{k+1}}$ for $r_k = \varrho 2^{-\frac{1}{2-\sigma}-k}$. In addition, we have that

$$\partial_t\Gamma(x,t)\leq Cf(x,t). \tag{3.3.2}$$

Here, $\nabla\Gamma(x,t)$ and $\partial_t\Gamma(x,t)$ denote any element of the superdifferential $\partial\Gamma(x,t)$ of Γ with respect to x and t respectively at (x,t).

[*Proof of Lemma 3.3.1*] Let $0<\sigma<2$ be given. Take any $(x,t)\in\mathcal{C}(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$. Since u can be touched by a hyperplane from above at (x,t), we see that $\nabla\varphi(x,t)=\nabla\Gamma(x,t)$ for some $\varphi\in C^2_{Q_1}(u;x,t)^+$.

If $|y|<1$, then $\mu(u,x,y,t)\le 0$ by the definition of Γ. If $|y|\ge 1$, then $|x\pm y|\ge|y|-|x|\ge 1-1/2=1/2$ because $\mathcal{C}(u,\Gamma,Q_1)\subset Q_{1/2}$. Thus we have that $u(x\pm y,t)\le 0$, and so we see that $\mu(u,x,y,t)\le 0$ for any y with $|y|\ge 1$. Therefore we conclude that $\mu(u,x,\cdot,t)\le 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$. This implies that $\mu^+(u,x,y,t)=0$. Since $\Gamma_t\ge 0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}-f(x,t)&\le\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}}u(x,t)-\partial_t\Gamma(x,t)\\&=(2-\sigma)\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{-\lambda\mu^-(u,x,y,t)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy-\partial_t\Gamma(x,t)\\&\le(2-\sigma)\int_{B_{r_0}}\frac{-\lambda\mu^-(u,x,y,t)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy\end{aligned}\tag{3.3.3}$$

where $r_0=\varrho 2^{-1/(2-\sigma)}$. Decomposing the above integral into the rings R_k, we have that

$$f(x,t)\ge(2-\sigma)\lambda\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\int_{R_k}\frac{\mu^-(u,x,y,t)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy.\tag{3.3.4}$$

Assume that the conclusion (3.3.1) does not hold, i.e. for any $C>0$ there are some $(x_0,t_0)\in\mathcal{C}(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$ and $\varrho_0,M_0>0$ such that

$$\left|\{y\in R_k:\mu^-(u,x_0,y,t_0)\ge M\,r_k^2\}\right|>C\,\frac{f(x_0,t_0)}{M_0}\,|R_k|$$

for all $k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$. Since $(2-\sigma)\frac{1}{1-2^{-(2-\sigma)}}$ remains bounded below for $\sigma\in(0,2)$, it thus follows from (3.3.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}f(x_0,t_0)&\ge(2-\sigma)\lambda\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\int_{R_k}\frac{\mu^-(u,x_0,y,t_0)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy\\&\ge c(2-\sigma)\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}M_0\,\frac{r_k^2}{r_k^\sigma}\,C\,\frac{f(x_0,t_0)}{M_0}\\&\ge\frac{c(2-\sigma)\rho_0^2}{1-2^{-(2-\sigma)}}\,C\,f(x_0,t_0)\ge c\,C\,f(x_0,t_0)\end{aligned}\tag{3.3.5}$$

for any $C>0$. Taking C large enough, we obtain a contradiction. Hence we are done.

Now we are going to control the time derivative of Γ. Since $\mu(u,x,y,t)\le 0$ for $y\in\mathbb{R}^n$ as in the above, we have that

$$\partial_t\Gamma(x,t)\le\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}}u(x,t)+f(x,t)\le f(x,t)$$

Hence we complete the proof. □

Lemma 3.3.1 and Lemma 3.2.3 give us the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3.2. *Under the same condition as Lemma 3.3.1, there is a universal constant* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\sup_{Q_1} \partial_t \Gamma \le C \sup_{Q_1} f.$$

To get a local estimate, let us introduce the following rectangles which is different from the standard parabolic rectangle since it incluses some future points: for $(x,t) \in Q_1$, we set

$$\mathcal{K}_r(x,t) = \{(y,s) : \max(|y_1 - x_1|^2, \cdots, |y_n - x_n|^2, |t-s|) < r^2\}.$$

Lemma 3.3.3. [CS] *Let* Γ *be a parabolic concave function on* $K_r(x,t)$ *where* $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *and let* $h > 0$. *If* $|\{y \in S_r(x) : \Gamma(y,t) < \Gamma(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t) - Cf(x,t)r^2\}| \le \epsilon\,|S_r(x)|$ *for any small* $\epsilon > 0$ *where* $S_r(x) = B_r(x) \setminus B_{r/2}(x)$, *then we have* $\Gamma(y,t) \ge \Gamma(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t) - Cf(x,t)r^2$ *for any* $(y,t) \in K_{r/2}(x,t)$.

Corollary 3.3.4. *Under the same condition as Lemma 3.3.3, there is some universal constant* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\Big|\Gamma(y,s) - \Gamma(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t)\Big| \le C\,r^2\Big(\sup_{\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)} f + r\sup_{Q_1} f\Big)$$

for any $(y,s) \in \mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)$.

Proof. We observe that $\partial_t\Gamma(y,s) \le C\,f(y,s)$ for any $(y,s) \in \mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t) \cap \mathcal{C}(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$.
(1.) First consider the case $s \le t$. From Corollary 3.3.2 and (ii) of Lemma 3.2.3, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(y,s) &\ge \Gamma(y,t) + (s-t)\partial_t\Gamma(y,t) - o(|s-t|)\\ &\ge \Gamma(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t) - Cf(x,t)r^2\\ &\quad + (s-t)\Big((1-c\,r)\sup_{y\in B_{r/2}(x)\cap C}\partial_t\Gamma(y,t) + c\,r\sup_{Q_1}\partial_t\Gamma\Big)\\ &\ge \Gamma(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t) - C\,r^2\Big(\sup_{\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)} f + r\sup_{Q_1} f\Big)\end{aligned}$$

for any $(y,s) \in K_{r/2}(x,t)$ such that $s \le t$. And

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(y,s) &\le \Gamma(y,t)\\ &\le \Gamma(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t)\end{aligned}$$

for the concavity of Γ.
(2.) Now we assume $s > t$.

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(y,s) &\ge \Gamma(y,t)\\ &\ge \Gamma(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t) - Cf(x,t)r^2\end{aligned}$$

for any $(y,s) \in \mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)$. And

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(y,s) &\leq \Gamma(y,t) + (s-t)\partial_t\Gamma(y,t) + o(|s-t|)\\ &\leq \Gamma(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t)\\ &\qquad + (s-t)\Big((1-c\,r)\sup_{y\in B_{r/2}(x)\cap C}\partial_t\Gamma(y,t) + c\,r\sup_{Q_1}\partial_t\Gamma\Big)\\ &\leq \Gamma(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t) + C\,r^2\Big(\sup_{\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)} f + r\sup_{Q_1} f\Big)\end{aligned}$$

for any $(y,s) \in \mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)$ such that $s > t$. □

Corollary 3.3.5. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any function u with the same hypothesis as Lemma 3.3.1 and for each $(x,t) \in C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$, there is some $r > 0$ and $r \in (0, 2\rho_0 2^{-\frac{1}{2-\sigma}})$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{|\{y \in S_r(x) : u(y,t) < u(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t) - C\xi_r(x,t)\}|}{|S_r(x)|} \leq \epsilon,\\ &|p(y,s) - \Gamma(y,s)| \leq C\xi_r(x,t)\end{aligned}$$

for any $(y,s) \in \mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)$, where $p(y,s) = \Gamma(x,t) + (y-x)\cdot\nabla_x\Gamma(x,t)$ and $\xi_r(x,t) = r^2\left(\sup_{\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)} f + r\sup_{Q_1} f\right)$.

Using Tso's argument on [D] and [T], we easily obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 3.3.6. *There is a universal constant $C_n > 0$ such that for any function u with the same hypothesis as Lemma 3.3.1,*

$$\Big(\sup_{Q_1} u^+\Big)^{n+1} \leq C_n\,|\mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(Q_1)|.$$

Corollary 3.3.7. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a universal constant $C > 0$ such that for any function u with the same hypothesis as Lemma 3.3.1 and for each $(x,t) \in C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$, there is a $r \in (0, 2\rho_0 2^{-\frac{1}{2-\sigma}})$ such that*

$$\Big|\mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t))\Big| \leq C\Big(\sup_{\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)} f + r\sup_{Q_1} f\Big)^{n+1} |\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t) \cap C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)|.$$

Proof. Fix any $(x,t) \in C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$. $\partial_t\Gamma(y,s) \leq Cf(y,s)$ for $(y,s) \in \mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t) \cap C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$. And from Corollary 3.3.5 and Lemma 3.2.4, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t))| &\leq C\int_{\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)\cap C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)} \partial_t\Gamma(y,s)\det[D_x^2\Gamma(y,s)]^-\,dy\,ds\\ &\leq C\Big(\sup_{\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t)} f + r\sup_{Q_1} f\Big)^{n+1} |\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x,t) \cap C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)|.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we complete the proof. □

We obtain a nonlocal version of Alexandroff-Bakelman-Pucci estimate in the following theorem as

Theorem 3.3.8. *Let u and Γ be functions as in Lemma 3.3.1. Then there exist a finite family $\{K_k\}$ of pairwise disjoint $(n+1)$-dimensional cubes with sidelength $r_k/2$ such that*

(*a*) $C(u,\Gamma,Q_1) \subset \bigcup_k K_k$,

(*b*) $C(u,\Gamma,Q_1) \cap K_k \neq \phi$ *for any* k, (*c*) $r_k \leq 2\rho_0 2^{-\frac{1}{2-\sigma}}$ *for any* k,

(*d*) $|\mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(K_k)| \leq C\left(\sup_{\overline{K}_k} f + r_k \sup_{Q_1} f\right)^{n+1}$
$\times|C(u,\Gamma,Q_1) \cap K_k|$

(*e*) $\left(\sup_{Q_1} u^+\right)^{n+1} \leq C\,|\mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(Q_1)|$

where the constants $C > 0$ depends on n, Λ and λ (but not on σ).

Proof. First we make dyadic disjoint $(n+1)$-dimensional cubes as the elliptic case, [CS, KL1, KL2]. It follows from Lemma 3.3.6, Corollary 3.3.7 with the same reason as [CS, KL1, KL2]. Otherwise, there is a sequence of contact points, $\{(x_j,t_j)\}$ which belong to dyadic cubes, K_{k_j} with lengths converging to zero i.e. $\{(x_j,t_j)\} \subset Q_1 \cap C$, $(x_j,t_j) \in K_{k_j}$ and $r_{k_j} \to 0$. Since Q_1 is compact, a subsequence of $\{(x_j,t_j)\}$ converges to a point $(x_0,t_0) \in Q_1 \cap C$. We will use the same notation for the subsequence of $\{(x_j,t_j)\}$. On the other hand there is a cube $\mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x_0,t_0)$ satisfying the conditions (a,b,c) and there is a large $N > 0$ such that $Q_{k_j} \subset \mathcal{K}_{r/2}(x_0,t_0)$ for $i > N$, which is a contradiction. □

Remark. It follows from Theorem 3.3.8 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\sup_{Q_1} u^+\right)^{n+1} &\leq \sum_k |\mathfrak{N}_\Gamma(K_k)| \\ &\leq C \sum_k \left(\sup_{\overline{K}_k} f + r_k \sup_{Q_1} f\right)^{n+1} |C(u,\Gamma,Q_1) \cap K_k|.\end{aligned}$$

As $\sigma \to 2$, the cube covering of $C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$ is getting close to the contact set $C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)$ and so the above becomes the following estimate

$$\sup_{Q_1} u^+ \leq C\left(\int_{C(u,\Gamma,Q_1)} [f(y,s)]^{n+1}\, dy\, ds\right)^{1/(n+1)}.$$

Our estimates remain uniform as the index σ of the operator is getting close to 2. Therefore this implies that our A-B-P estimate can be regarded as a natural extension of that for parabolic partial differential equations.

4. Decay Estimate of Upper Level Sets

In this section, we are going to show the geometric decay rate of the upper level set of nonnegative solution u. The key Lemma 4.2.1 says that if a nonnegative function u has a value smaller than one in $\mathrm{K}^+_{3r_0}$ then the lower level set $\{u \leq M\} \cap \mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}$ has at least uniformly positive amount of measure $\nu|\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}|$ which will be proven through ABP estimate. But the assumption of ABP estimate on a subsolution requires its special shape: it should be nonpositive $\partial^*_p Q$ and positive at some interior point. So we are going to construct a special function Ψ so that $\Psi - u$ meets the requirement of ABP estimate.

4.1. **Special functions.**

The construction of the special function is based on the idea in [CS, KL1, KL2, W1]. Nontrivial finer computation has been done to detect the influence of values along the time.

Lemma 4.1.1. *Let $Q = B_1 \times (0,1]$ and $0 < r < 1/(2\sqrt{n})$. Then there exist some $\sigma^* \in (1,2)$ and a subsolution $\psi(x,t)$ such that for any $\sigma \in (\sigma^*, 2)$,*

$$\begin{cases} \psi_t(x,t) \le \mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}}\psi(x,t), & (x,t) \in Q \setminus \mathrm{K}^-_{r/2} \\ \psi(x,t) \ge 1 \quad \text{in } \mathrm{K}^+_{3r} \\ \psi(x,t) \le 0 \quad \text{on } \partial^*_p Q. \end{cases} \tag{4.1.1}$$

Proof. We set

$$h(x,t) = \min\left\{2^n, \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{n/\sigma}} \exp\left(-\alpha\frac{|x|^\sigma}{t}\right)\right\}, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in I,$$

and $f(x,t) = e^{-\beta t} h(x,t)^\gamma$ for $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$. If $|x|^\sigma \ge t$ and $0 < t \le (2^{-\sigma} e^{-\alpha\sigma/n})/4\pi$, then we consider the function $g(y,s) = |x|^n f(x,t)$ where $x = |x|y$ and $t = |x|^\sigma s$. Then $g(y,s) = e^{-\beta\eta^\sigma s} h(y,s)^\gamma$ for $\eta = |x|$ and we note that

$$\mathcal{L}f(x,t) = \frac{1}{|x|^{n+\sigma}} \mathcal{L}g\left(\frac{x}{|x|}, \frac{t}{|x|^\sigma}\right) \text{ and } f_t(x,t) = \frac{1}{|x|^{n+\sigma}} g_t\left(\frac{x}{|x|}, \frac{t}{|x|^\sigma}\right).$$

If we choose the normalization $y \in S^{n-1}$, then it is enough to show that there is some $\sigma^* \in (1,2)$ so that

$$\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} g(e_n, s) \ge g_s(e_n, s) \text{ on } Q \setminus \mathrm{K}^-_{r/2} \tag{4.1.2}$$

for $x = e_n = (0,0,\cdots,0,1) \in \mathbb{R}^n$; for, the above inequality follows by scaling and rotation for every other x with $|x| = 1$. Then we have that, $\tilde\beta = \beta\eta^\sigma$

(4.1.3)

$$g_s = e^{-\tilde\beta t} h^\gamma\left(-\tilde\beta + \gamma\alpha\frac{|x|^\sigma}{s^2} - \frac{\gamma n}{\sigma s}\right), \ g_t(e_n, s) = \frac{e^{-\tilde\beta t} e^{-\gamma\tilde\alpha}}{(4\pi s)^{n\gamma/\sigma}}\left(-\tilde\beta + \frac{\gamma\tilde\alpha}{s^2} - \frac{\gamma n}{\sigma s}\right).$$

By the Taylor's expansion, we obtain that, for $\tilde{\alpha} = \frac{\alpha}{t}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma|e_n \pm y|^\sigma} &= e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma} \mp \sigma\tilde{\alpha}\gamma e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma} y_n + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\, e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}\Big\{\Big(\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma + (2-\sigma)\Big)y_n^2 - |y|^2\Big\} \\
&\mp \frac{1}{6}\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\, e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}\Big\{\Big[\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\Big(\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma + 3(2-\sigma)\Big) + (2-\sigma)(4-\sigma)\Big]y_n^3 \\
&\qquad\qquad - 3\Big(\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma + (2-\sigma)\Big)y_n|y|^2\Big\} \\
&+ \frac{1}{24}\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma(2-\sigma)\, e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}\Big\{2\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\Big(3\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma + 2(4-\sigma)\Big) + (4-\sigma)(6-\sigma)\Big\}y_n^4 \\
&+ \frac{1}{4}\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma(2-\sigma)\, e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}\Big\{\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\Big(\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma + 2(2-\sigma)\Big) + (2-\sigma)(4-\sigma)\Big\}y_n^2|y|^2 \\
&+ \frac{1}{24}\tilde{\alpha}^4\gamma^4\sigma^4\, e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma} y_n^4 + \frac{1}{8}\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma(2-\sigma)\, e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}|y|^4 + o(|y|^4).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1.4}
$$

If we denote by $\sigma_k = \int_{S^{n-1}} \theta_n^k \, d\sigma(\theta)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then we may now choose some large enough $\gamma > 1$ so that

$$
I(\sigma_2, \tilde{\alpha}, \gamma, \sigma) \fallingdotseq \Big(\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma + (2-\sigma)\Big)\sigma_2 - \omega_n > 0 \tag{4.1.5}
$$

for any $\sigma \in (0,2)$, where ω_n denote the surface measure of S^{n-1} and $r > 0$ is the constant to be given just below. Since the 4^{th} order term of (4.1.4) is positive, by (4.1.5) there is a sufficiently small $r \in (0, 1/2)$ (and fix) so that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(4\pi t)^{n\gamma/\sigma}\mu(g, e_n, y, s) &\geq \tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\, e^{-\tilde{\beta}s - \tilde{\alpha}\gamma}\Big\{\Big(\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma + (2-\sigma)\Big)y_n^2 - |y|^2\Big\} \\
&+ \frac{1}{24}\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma(2-\sigma)\, e^{-\tilde{\beta}s - \tilde{\alpha}\gamma}\Big\{2\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\Big(3\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma + 2(4-\sigma)\Big) + (4-\sigma)(6-\sigma)\Big\}y_n^4 \\
&+ \frac{1}{4}\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma(2-\sigma)\, e^{-\tilde{\beta}s - \tilde{\alpha}\gamma}\Big\{\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\Big(\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma + 2(2-\sigma)\Big) + (2-\sigma)(4-\sigma)\Big\}y_n^2|y|^2 \\
&+ \frac{1}{24}\tilde{\alpha}^4\gamma^4\sigma^4\, e^{-\tilde{\beta}s - \tilde{\alpha}\gamma} y_n^4 + \frac{1}{8}\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma(2-\sigma)\, e^{-\tilde{\beta}s - \tilde{\alpha}\gamma}|y|^4 > 0
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1.6}
$$

for any $y \in B_r$. Then for a small $\tau > 0$ which will be chosen later, we have the estimate, by (4.1.6),

(4.1.7)

$$\begin{aligned}
&(2-\sigma)\lambda(4\pi t)^{n\gamma/\sigma}\int_{B_r\setminus B_\tau}\frac{\mu(g,e_n,y,t)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy \geq \frac{\lambda\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma}{e^{\tilde{\beta}s+\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}}\,I(\sigma_2,\tilde{\alpha},\gamma,\sigma)\,(r^{2-\sigma}-\tau^{2-\sigma})\\
&\quad+\frac{\lambda}{24}\frac{\sigma_4}{e^{\tilde{\beta}s+\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}}\Big[\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma(2-\sigma)\Big\{2\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\Big(3\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma+2(4-\sigma)\Big)+(4-\sigma)(6-\sigma)\Big\}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad+\tilde{\alpha}^4\gamma^4\sigma^4\Big]\,\frac{2-\sigma}{4-\sigma}\,(r^{4-\sigma}-\tau^{4-\sigma})\\
&\quad+\frac{\lambda}{4}\frac{\sigma_2\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma}{e^{\tilde{\beta}s+\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}}\Big\{\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\Big(\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma+2(2-\sigma)\Big)+(2-\sigma)(4-\sigma)\Big\}\frac{(2-\sigma)^2}{4-\sigma}\,(r^{4-\sigma}-\tau^{4-\sigma})\\
&\quad+\frac{\lambda\omega_n}{8}\frac{\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma}{e^{\tilde{\beta}s+\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}}\,\frac{(2-\sigma)^2}{4-\sigma}(r^{4-\sigma}-\tau^{4-\sigma})\\
&\quad\fallingdotseq\frac{\lambda\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma}{2e^{\tilde{\beta}s+\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}}\,I(\sigma_2,\tilde{\alpha},\gamma,\sigma)\,r^{2-\sigma}+e^{-\tilde{\beta}-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}a(\lambda,\sigma_2,\sigma_4,\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\beta},\gamma,\sigma)\,\frac{2-\sigma}{4-\sigma}\,r^{4-\sigma}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\lim_{\sigma\to2^-}a(\lambda,\sigma_2,\sigma_4,\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\beta},\gamma,\sigma)=\frac{\lambda}{24}\,\sigma_4(8+16\tilde{\alpha}^4\gamma^4)>0.$$

Since $\mu^-(g,e_n,y,s)\leq\frac{2^{n+2}}{(4\pi s)^{n\gamma/\sigma}}e^{-\tilde{\beta}s-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, it follows from (4.1.3), (4.1.5), (4.1.6) and (4.1.7) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{L}}\,g(e_n,s)-g_t(e_n,s)\\
&\geq(2-\sigma)\lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{\mu^+(g,e_n,y,s)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy-(2-\sigma)\Lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\frac{\mu^-(g,e_n,y,s)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy-g_t(e_n,t)\\
&\geq(2-\sigma)\lambda\int_{B_r}\frac{\mu(g,e_n,y,s)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy-(2-\sigma)\Lambda\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_r}\frac{\mu^-(g,e_n,y,s)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy-g_t(e_n,t)\\
&\geq\frac{e^{-\tilde{\beta}s-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}}{(4\pi s)^{n\gamma/\sigma}}\Big[\lambda\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma\,I(\sigma_2,\tilde{\alpha},\gamma,\sigma)\,r^{2-\sigma}+a(\lambda,\sigma_2,\sigma_4,\tilde{\alpha},\tilde{\beta},\gamma,\sigma)\,\frac{2-\sigma}{4-\sigma}\,r^{4-\sigma}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad-2^{n+2}\Lambda\omega_n\frac{2-\sigma}{\sigma}r^{-\sigma}\Big]-g_t(e_n,s).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we may take some $\sigma^*\in(1,2)$ close enough to 2 in the above and some sufficiently small $\tilde{\beta}\in(0,1)$ with $\tilde{\alpha}=n/\sigma$ so that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{L}}\,g(e_n,s)-g_t(e_n,s)\geq0$ for any $\sigma\in(\sigma^*,2)$. To complete the proof, we take $\psi(x,t)=\min(\max(f(x,t)-\zeta,0),At)$ with a small $\zeta>0$ such that $\operatorname{supp}[\max(f(x,t)-\zeta,0)]\subset Q$ and a large $A>0$ such that $\{(x,t):\max(f(x,t)-\zeta,0)\geq At\}\subset B_\tau\times[0,\tau^\sigma]$ for $0<\tau<<r$. Now $\psi(x,t)$ which satisfies (4.1.1). □

Corollary 4.1.2. *Let $Q=B_1\times(0,1]$ and $0<r<1/(2\sqrt{n})$. Given $\sigma_0\in(0,2)$, there is some very small $\delta\in(0,1)$ and a subsolution $\psi^\delta(x,t)$ such that for any*

$\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$,

$$\begin{cases} \psi^\delta_t(x,t) \le \mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} \psi^\delta(x,t), & (x,t) \in Q \setminus \mathrm{K}^-_{r/2} \\ \psi^\delta(x,t) \ge 1 \quad in \ \mathrm{K}^+_{3r} \\ \psi^\delta(x,t) \le 0 \quad on \ \partial^*_p Q. \end{cases} \tag{4.1.8}$$

Proof. Let $\sigma^* \in (1,2)$ be the number of Lemma 4.1.1. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\sigma_0 < \sigma^*$. Lemma 4.1.1 implies that the result of our corollary always holds for $\sigma \in (\sigma^*, 2)$, when $\delta = 1/2$. We set

$$h_\delta(x,t) = \min\left\{ \delta^{-n}, \frac{1}{(4\pi t)^{n/\sigma}} \exp\left(-\alpha \frac{|x|^\sigma}{t}\right) \right\}, \ x \in \mathbb{R}^n, t \in I,$$

and $f_\delta(x,t) = e^{-\tilde\beta t} h_\delta(x,t)^\gamma$ for $\alpha, \beta, \gamma > 0$. If $|x|^\sigma \ge t$ and $0 < t \le (\delta^\sigma e^{-\alpha\sigma/n})/4\pi$, then we consider the function $g_\delta(y,s) = |x|^n f_\delta(x,t)$ where $x = |x|y$ and $t = |x|^\sigma s$. Set $\mu = |x|$. Then $g_\delta(y,s) = e^{-\beta\mu^\sigma s} h_\delta(y,s)^\gamma$ and we note that

$$\mathcal{L} f_\delta(x,t) = \frac{1}{|x|^{n+\sigma}} \mathcal{L} g_\delta\Big(\frac{x}{|x|}, \frac{t}{|x|^\sigma}\Big) \ \text{ and } \ f_{\delta,t}(x,t) = \frac{1}{|x|^{n+\sigma}} g_{\delta,t}\Big(\frac{x}{|x|}, \frac{t}{|x|^\sigma}\Big).$$

If $\delta < 1/2$, then the result still holds for $\sigma \in (\sigma^*, 2)$ because $\mu(f_\delta, x, y, t) \ge \mu(f_{1/2}, x, y, t)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in I$.

Now we let $x = e_n$ as in the proof of Lemma 4.1.1. Assume that $\sigma_0 < \sigma \le \sigma^*$. Then we write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}}\, g_\delta(e_n, 1) &= (2-\sigma)\lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\mu^+(g_\delta, e_n, y, s)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\, dy - (2-\sigma)\Lambda \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\mu^-(g_\delta, e_n, y, s)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\, dy \\ &\eqqcolon \mathcal{J}_1 g_\delta(e_n, s) + \mathcal{J}_2 g_\delta(e_n, s). \end{aligned}$$

If we take some $h > 0$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$ small enough so that $\mu^-(g_\delta, e_n, y, s) = 0$ for any $y \in B_{1+h}$, from (4.1.4) and simple geometric observation it is easy to check that there is some $c > 0$ not depending on α, β, γ and σ such that, for $\tilde\alpha = \frac{\alpha}{t}$,

$$\mu^-(g_\delta, e_n, y, s) \le c\, \frac{2e^{-\beta\mu^\sigma s - \tilde\alpha\gamma}}{(4\pi s)^{\gamma n/\sigma}}$$

for any $y \in B^c_{1+h}$. Thus we have that

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{J}_2 g_\delta(e_n, s) &= (2-\sigma)\Lambda \int_{|y|\ge 1+h} \frac{\mu^-(g_\delta, e_n, y, s)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\, dy \\ &\le (2-\sigma_0)\Lambda \frac{2e^{-\beta\mu^\sigma s - \tilde\alpha\gamma}}{(4\pi s)^{\gamma n/\sigma}} \int_{|y|\ge 1+h} \frac{c}{|y|^{n+\sigma_0}}\, dy. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$, we see that $\mathcal{J}_2 g_\delta(e_n, s) \ge -c_0 \dfrac{e^{-\beta\mu^\sigma s - \tilde\alpha\gamma}}{(4\pi s)^{\gamma n/\sigma}}$ for a constant $c_0 > 0$ depending only on σ_0, Λ and the dimension n. On the other hand, from the geometric observation we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^+(g_\delta, e_n, y, s) &= \mu(g_\delta, e_n, y, s) + \mu(g_\delta, e_n, -y, s) \\ &\ge \mu(g_\delta, e_n, y, s) \ge 0 \end{aligned}$$

for any $y \in B_1$. Since the following inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mu(g_\delta, e_n, y, s) &= \frac{e^{-\beta\mu^\sigma s}}{(4\pi s)^{\gamma n/\sigma}}\Big[e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma|e_n+y|^\sigma} - e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}\Big(1 - \tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma y_n \chi_{B_1}(y)\Big)\Big] \\
&\geq \frac{e^{-\beta}\mu^\sigma s}{(4\pi s)^{\gamma n/\sigma}}\Big[e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma|e_n+y|^\sigma} + e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}(\delta\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma - 1)\Big] \\
&\geq \frac{e^{-\beta}\mu^\sigma s}{(4\pi s)^{\gamma n/\sigma}}\Big[e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma(1-\delta/2)^\sigma} + e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma}(\delta\tilde{\alpha}\gamma\sigma - 1)\Big] \\
&\geq \frac{e^{-\beta}\mu^\sigma s}{2(4\pi s)^{\gamma n/\sigma}}\Big[e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma(1-\delta/2)^\sigma}\Big]
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.1.9}
$$

holds for any y with $\delta/2 < |y - 5\delta/2| < 3\delta/2$ and $y \cdot e_n > \frac{1}{2}|y|$, if we set $\delta = 1/(\gamma\sigma)$ then we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_1 g_\delta(e_n, s) &\geq \frac{(2-\sigma)\lambda e^{-\beta\mu^\sigma s}\mu^\sigma s}{(4\pi s)^{\gamma n/\sigma}} \int_{\frac{\delta}{2} < |y - \frac{5\delta}{2}| < \frac{3\delta}{2}} \frac{e^{-\tilde{\alpha}\gamma|e_n+y|^\sigma}}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\, dy \\
&\geq \frac{(2-\sigma)\lambda}{(4\pi)^{\gamma n/\sigma}(s)^{\gamma n/\sigma - 1}} \frac{e^{-\beta\mu^\sigma s - \tilde{\alpha}\gamma(1-\delta/2)^\sigma}}{(4\delta)^{n+\sigma}}\left[\left(\frac{3\delta}{2}\right)^n - \left(\frac{\delta}{2}\right)^n\right] \\
&= (2-\sigma)\lambda \frac{e^{-\beta\mu^\sigma s - \tilde{\alpha}\gamma(1-\delta/2)^\sigma}}{(4\pi)^{\gamma n/\sigma}(s)^{\gamma n/\sigma - 1}} \frac{1}{4^{n+\sigma}\delta^\sigma} \frac{3^n - 1}{2^n}.
\end{aligned}
$$

If we select some sufficiently large $\gamma > 1$ so that $\delta = 1/(\gamma\sigma)$ is very small and $\mathcal{J}_1 g_\delta(e_n, s) > c_0 \dfrac{e^{-\beta\mu^\sigma s - \tilde{\alpha}\gamma}}{(4\pi)^{\gamma n/\sigma}(s)^{\gamma n/\sigma - 1}}$, then we can complete the proof by taking $\psi^\delta(x,t) = \min(\max(f_\delta(x,t) - \eta, 0), At)$ for a small $\eta > 0$ and a large $A > 0$ as Lemma 4.1.1. □

Lemma 4.1.3. *Let* $Q = B_1 \times (0,1]$, $\partial_p^* Q = (\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,1]) \setminus Q$ *and* $r \in (0, 1/(3\sqrt{n}))$. *Given any* $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$, *there exists a function* $\Psi \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,1])$ *such that*
(*a*) Ψ *is continuous on* $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,1]$, (*b*) $\Psi \leq 0$ *on* $\partial_p Q$, (*c*) $\Psi > 2$ *on* K^+_{3r},
(*d*) $\Psi \leq M$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,1]$ *for some* $M > 1$, (*e*) $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}}\Psi$ *is continuous on* Q,
(*f*) $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}}\Psi - \Psi_t > -\psi$ *on* Q *where* ψ *is a positive bounded function on* $\mathbb{R}^n \times [0,1]$ *which is supported on* $\overline{\mathrm{K}^-_{r/2}}$, *for any* $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$.

Proof. We consider the function $\Psi = c\,\psi^\delta$ for $c > 0$. And we choose some constants $c > 0$ and $\delta > 0$ so that $\Psi > 2$ on Q^+_{3r} and $\Psi \leq M$ for some $M > 1$. Since $\Psi \in \mathrm{C}^{1,1}_x(Q)$, we see that $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}}\Psi$ is continuous on Q. Also by Corollary 4.1.2 we see that $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}}\Psi - \Psi_t \geq 0$ on $(\mathbb{R}^n \times I) \setminus \mathrm{K}^-_{r/2}$. Hence we complete the proof. □

4.2. **Key Lemmas.** Now we are going to show a decay estimate of the upper level set at past time depending on the future value , which will be a key step to have geometric decay rate of the upper level set in dyadic rectangles.

Lemma 4.2.1. *Let* $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$ *and* $r_0 = 1/(9\sqrt{n})$. *If* $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$, *then there exist some constants* $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $\nu \in (0,1)$ *and* $M > 1$ *(depending only on* $\sigma_0, \lambda, \Lambda$ *and the dimension* n*) for which if* $u \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)$ *is a viscosity supersolution to* $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \leq \varepsilon_0$ *on* Q *such that* $u \geq 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^n \times I$ *and* $\inf_{\mathrm{K}^+_{3r_0}} u \leq 1$, *then* $|\{u \leq M\} \cap \mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}| \geq \nu |\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}|$

Proof. We consider the function $v := \Psi - u$ where Ψ is the special function constructed in Lemma 4.1.3. Then we easily see that v is upper semicontinuous on $\overline{Q}$ and v is not positive on $\partial^*_p Q$. Moreover, v is a viscosity subsolution to $\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} v - v_t \geq \mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} \Psi - \Psi_t - (\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t) \geq -(\psi + \varepsilon_0)$ on Q. So we want to apply Theorem 3.3.8 to v. Let Γ be the concave envelope of v in Q. Since $\inf_{\mathrm{K}^+_{3r_0}} u \leq 1$ and $\inf_{\mathrm{K}^+_{3r_0}} \Psi > 2$, we easily see that $M_0 := \sup_{\mathrm{K}^+_{3r_0}} v = v(x_0) > 1$ for some $x_0 \in \mathrm{K}^+_{3r_0}$. We also observe as shown in [CC] that

$$\left|\nabla\Gamma\Big(Q \setminus C(v,\Gamma,Q), t\Big)\right| = 0 \tag{4.2.1}$$

for each t. Let $\{K_j\}$ be the family of cubes given by Theorem 3.3.8 with $0 < r_j < \frac{r_0}{10^n} 2^{-\frac{1}{2-\sigma}}$. Then it follows from (4.2.1) and Theorem 3.3.8 that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 < \Big(\sup_Q v\Big)^{n+1} &\leq C \int_{C(v,\Gamma,Q)} \partial_t \Gamma(y,s) \det[D^2\Gamma(y,s)]^- \, dyds \\ &\leq C\Big(\sum_j \Big(\sup_{\overline{K}_j} (\psi + \varepsilon_0)^{n+1} + r_j \sup_Q (\psi+\varepsilon_0)^{n+1}\Big) |K_j \cap C(v,\Gamma,Q)|\Big) \\ &\leq C\varepsilon_0 + C\Big(\sum_j (\sup_{\overline{K}_j} \psi)^{n+1} |K_j \cap C(v,\Gamma,Q)|\Big) + \frac{1}{4} \end{aligned} \tag{4.2.2}$$

for a snall r_0 and some universal constant $C > 0$. If we choose ε_0 small enough, the above inequality (4.2.2) implies that

$$\frac{1}{2^{1/(n+1)}} \leq C\Big(\sum_j (\sup_{\overline{K}_j} \psi)^{n+1} |K_j \cap C(v,\Gamma,Q)|\Big)^{1/(n+1)}.$$

We recall from the proof of Lemma 4.1.3 that ψ is supported on $\overline{\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0/2}}$ and bounded on $\mathbb{R}^n \times I$. Thus the above inequality becomes

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq C\Big(\sum_{K_j \cap \overline{\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0/2}} \neq \phi} |K_j \cap C(v,\Gamma,Q)| \Big),$$

which provides a lower bound for the sum of the volumes of the cones K_j intersecting $\overline{\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0/2}}$ as follows;

$$\sum_{K_j \cap \overline{\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0/2}} \neq \phi} |K_j \cap C(v,\Gamma,Q)| \geq \nu |\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}|. \tag{4.2.3}$$

Since $\mathrm{diam}(K_j) \le \frac{r_0}{10^n} 2^{-\frac{1}{2-\sigma}} \le \frac{r_0}{10^n}$ for any $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$, each cone K_j is contained in $\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}$ for any K_j with $K_j \cap \mathrm{K}^-_{r_0/2} \neq \phi$. Thus by Lemma 4.1.3 we have that

$$K_j \cap \mathcal{C}(v, \Gamma, Q) \subset \{v \ge 0\} = \{u \le \Psi\} \subset \{u \le M\}$$

for all j with $K_j \cap \overline{\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0/2}} \neq \phi$. Hence we conclude $|\{u \le M\} \cap \mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}| \ge \nu |\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}|$. □

Definition 4.2.2. (*i*) *We say that u has a tangent paraboloid of aperture $h > 0$ below at (x_0, t_0) if there is a quadratic polynomial*

$$P(x,t) = c + b_i(x^i - x^i_0) + h(-\frac{1}{2}|x - x_0|^2 + (t_0 - t))$$

such that

$$\begin{cases} u(x,t) \ge P(x,t) \text{ in } Q \cap \{t \le t_0\} \\ u(x_0,t_0) = P(x_0,t_0). \end{cases} \tag{4.2.4}$$

(*ii*) *We denote by $\mathcal{G}^u_h$ the set of points where u has global tangent paraboloid of aperture $h > 0$ from below. And we set $\mathcal{B}^u_h = K_1 \setminus \mathcal{G}^u_h$.*

From the same reason as [W1], we will have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.2.3. *Under the same condition as Lemma 4.2.1, there exist some constants $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, $\nu \in (0,1)$ and $M > 1$ (depending only on $\sigma_0, \lambda, \Lambda$ and the dimension n) for which if $u \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)$ is a viscosity supersolution to $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \le \varepsilon_0$ on Q such that $u \ge 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times I$ and $\inf_{\mathrm{K}^+_{3r_0}} u \le 1$, or $\mathrm{K}^+_{3r_0} \cap \mathcal{G}^u_1 \neq \emptyset$, then $|\mathcal{G}^u_M \cap \mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}| \ge \nu |\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}|$*

4.3. **Nonlocal Parabolic Calderón-Zygmund decomposition.** The parabolic version of Calderón-Zygmund decomposition has been introduced at [W1]. The main difference between elliptic and parabolic version lies in the fact that the parabolic version requires a time interval for some information to propagate along the time through space-time scale which is invariant under the parabolic equation, while the elliptic version have no such time delay since the stay state describes the behavior of solution after infinite time. To detect the influence of the time variable, for a given cube K, two different associated sets will be introduced: the time elongation and the expansion of K along time.

Definition 4.3.1. *For a cube $\mathrm{K} = (-r,r)^n \times (0, r^\sigma] + (x,t)$ in space-time variable, set $l(\mathrm{K})$ to be the length of K in the time variable.*

(*i*) *The elongation $\overline{\mathrm{K}}^m$ of K along time in m steps is defined by*

$$\overline{\mathrm{K}}^m = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m} \Big((-r,r)^n \times \Big(\frac{3^{\sigma i} - 1}{3^\sigma - 1} r^\sigma, \frac{3^{\sigma(i+1)} - 1}{3^\sigma - 1} r^\sigma \Big] \Big) + (x,t)$$

(*ii*) *The expansion $\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^m$ of K along time in m steps is defined by*

$$\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^m = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m} \Big((-3^i r, 3^i r)^n \times \Big(\frac{3^{\sigma i} - 1}{3^\sigma - 1} r^\sigma, \frac{3^{\sigma(i+1)} - 1}{3^\sigma - 1} r^\sigma \Big] \Big) + (x,t).$$

From the definition we have $\overline{\mathrm{K}}^m \subset \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^m$. We divide K_1^- step by step. First notice that there is an increasing sequence of rational numbers $\frac{p_m}{m}$ such that $\frac{p_m}{m} \to \sigma$. Set $N_m = 2^{p_m} \times 2^m$ for $0 < \sigma \leq 1$, and $2^{p_m} \times 2^{p_m + m(m-p_m)}$ for $1 < \sigma < 2$. After m^{th} step, we obtain cubes K_r of the form $\mathrm{K}_r = \mathrm{K}_r^-(x,t)$. Then we split K_r into N_m cubes by dividing the time interval into 2^m subintervals for $0 < \sigma \leq 1$ and $2^{p_m + m(m-p_m)}$ subsintervals for $1 < \sigma < 2$, and the rectangle in x-variable into equal 2^{np_m}-subcubes. We do the same splitting step with each one of these N_m cubes and we continue this process. The cubes obtained in this way are called *dyadic cubes.* If K and $\overline{\mathrm{K}}$ are two dyadic cubes, then we say that $\overline{\mathrm{K}}$ is the *predecessor* of K if K is one of N cubes obtained from splitting $\overline{\mathrm{K}}$. Now we have a parabolic version of Calderón-Zygmund decomposition.

Lemma 4.3.2 (Lemma 3.23, [W1])**.** *Let* $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathrm{K}_1^- = (-1,1)^n \times (0,1]$ *be a measurable set. For* $\delta \in (0,1)$*, we set*

$$\mathcal{A}_\delta^m = \cup\{\overline{\mathrm{K}}^m : |\mathrm{K} \cap \mathcal{A}| \geq \delta|\mathrm{K}|,\ \mathrm{K}\, \textit{dyadic cubes}\} \cap \{|x^i| \leq 1\}.$$

Then we have that

$$|\mathcal{A}_\delta^m| \geq \frac{m}{(m+1)\delta}|\mathcal{A}|.$$

We need the following version of Calderon-Zygmund decomposition in the following form.

Corollary 4.3.3. *Let* $\mathfrak{B} \subset \mathrm{K}_1^- = (-1,1)^n \times (0,1]$ *be a measurable set. For* $\delta \in (0,1)$ *and any dyadic cube* $\mathrm{K} = \mathrm{K}_r^-(x,t)$*, we set* $\overline{\mathrm{K}}_*^m = (x + (-r,r)^n) \times (t, t + \frac{3^{\sigma(m+1)}-1}{3^\sigma - 1} r^\sigma]$*. Let*

$$\mathfrak{B}_\delta^m = \cup\{\overline{\mathrm{K}}_*^m : |\mathrm{K} \cap \mathfrak{B}| \geq \delta|\mathrm{K}|,\ \mathrm{K}\, \textit{dyadic cubes}\} \cap \{|x^i| \leq 1\}.$$

Then we have that

$$|\mathfrak{B}_\delta^m| \geq \frac{m}{(m+1)\delta}|\mathfrak{B}|.$$

We note that $\overline{\mathrm{K}}_*^m = \overline{\mathrm{K}}^m$ for any dyadic cube $\mathrm{K} = \mathrm{K}_r^-(x,t)$.

4.4. **Decay estimate through iterations.** The following lemma is a consequence of Lemma 4.2.1 and Lemma 4.3.2.

Lemma 4.4.1. *Given* $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$*, let* $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$*. Let* ε_0, r_0 *be the constants in Lemma 4.2.1. If* $u \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)$ *is a viscosity supersolution to* $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{L}}^- u - u_t \leq \varepsilon_0$ *on* Q *such that* $u \geq 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^n \times I$ *and* $\inf_{\mathrm{K}_{3r_0}^+} u \leq 1$*, then there are universal constants* $C > 0$ *and* $\varepsilon_* > 0$ *such that*

$$\left|\mathcal{B}_s^u \cap \mathrm{K}_{r_0}^-\right| \leq C s^{-\varepsilon_*} |\mathrm{K}_{r_0}^-|,\ \forall\, s > 0.$$

Proof. (i) First, we shall prove that there is $\beta \geq 1$ such that

$$\left|\mathcal{B}_{M^{\beta k}}^u \cap \mathrm{K}_{r_0}^-\right| \leq (1 - \nu/2)^k |\mathrm{K}_{r_0}^-|,\ \forall\, k \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{4.4.1}$$

where $\nu > 0$ is the constant as in Lemma 4.2.1. We will prove it by induction. The case $k = 1$ has been proved at Lemma 4.2.1 for $\beta \geq 1$. Assume that the result (4.4.1) holds for k ($k \geq 1$). Set $\mathfrak{B} = \mathcal{B}^u_{M^{\beta(k+1)}} \cap \mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}$. We choose a large m such that $1 > 1 - \nu/2 > \frac{(m+1)(1-\nu)}{m} > 0$ and consider $\mathfrak{B}^m_\delta$ at Corollary 4.3.3 with $\delta = 1 - \nu$. We claim that

$$\mathfrak{B}^m_\delta \subset \mathcal{B}^u_{M^{\beta k}} \cap \mathrm{K}^-_{r_0} \tag{4.4.2}$$

for a uniform constant $\beta \geq 1$ independent of k. If the claim is true and if $|\mathfrak{B}| > (1-\nu/2)^{k+1}\,|\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}|$, then we have that

$$|\mathcal{B}^u_{M^{\beta k}} \cap \mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}| \geq |\mathfrak{B}^m_\delta| \geq \frac{m}{(m+1)\delta}|\mathfrak{B}| > \frac{(1-\nu/2)^{k+1}}{1-\nu/2}|\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}| = (1-\nu/2)^k|\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}|,$$

which is a contradiction against the assumption. Therefore we have that $|\mathcal{B}^u_{M^{\beta(k+1)}} \cap \mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}| = |\mathfrak{B}| \leq (1-\nu)^{k+1}\,|\mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}|$.

(ii) Now we are going to show the claim. If the claim is not rue, there is $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathfrak{B}^m_\delta \backslash \left(\mathcal{B}^u_{M^{\beta k}} \cap \mathrm{K}^-_{r_0}\right)$, which implies that there is a dyadic cube $\mathrm{K} = \mathrm{K}^-_r$ such that $(x_0, t_0) \in \overline{\mathrm{K}}^m_*$ and

$$|\mathfrak{B} \cap \mathrm{K}| \geq \delta|\mathrm{K}| \tag{4.4.3}$$

and $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathcal{G}^u_{M^{\beta k}} \cap \left(\overline{\mathrm{K}}^j_* \backslash \overline{\mathrm{K}}^{j-1}_*\right) = \mathcal{G}^u_{M^{\beta k}} \cap \left(\overline{\mathrm{K}}^j_* \backslash \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-1}\right)$ for some $1 \leq j \leq m$. By the definition of an expansion $\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^j$ of K along the time, we have $(x_0, t_0) \in \overline{\mathrm{K}}^j_* \subset \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^j$.

(iii) Now we are going to apply Lemma 4.2.1 backward from j to 1 after scaling to show that

$$|\mathcal{G}^u_{M^i M^{\beta k}} \cap \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i}| \geq \nu 3^{(j-i)(n+\sigma)}|\mathrm{K}| \tag{4.4.4}$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, j$. If (4.4.4) is true, then since $\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^0 = \mathrm{K}$ we have

$$|\mathrm{K} \setminus \mathfrak{B}| = |\mathcal{G}^u_{M^{\beta(k+1)}} \cap \mathrm{K}| > |\mathcal{G}^u_{M^j M^{\beta k}} \cap \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^0| \geq \nu|\mathrm{K}|$$

for $\beta = m + 1$ independent of k. Now we have a contradiction against (4.4.3) since

$$|\mathrm{K} \cap \mathfrak{B}| < (1-\nu)|\mathrm{K}| = \delta|\mathrm{K}|$$

and then the claim (4.4.1).

(iv) Now we are going to show (4.4.4). Assume that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{G}^u_{M^{i-1}M^{\beta k}} \cap \left(\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i+1} \backslash \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i}\right) \\ &\qquad = \mathcal{G}^u_{M^{i-1}M^{\beta k}} \cap \left[\left(\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i+1} \setminus \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i-1}\right) \setminus \left(\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i} \setminus \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i-1}\right)\right] \neq \emptyset, \end{aligned} \tag{4.4.5}$$

which is true for $i = 1$. Then there is some $(y_0, s_0) \in \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i+1} \setminus \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i-1}$ such that $\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i} \setminus \tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i-1} = \mathrm{K}^-_{3^{j-i}r}(y_0, s_0)$. Now we consider the transformation

$$x = y_0 + (3^{j-i}r)z, \;\; t = s_0 + (3^{j-i}r)^\sigma\tau$$

and the function $v(z,\tau)=u(x,t)/M^{\beta k+i-1}$ for $(z,\tau)\in\mathrm{K}_1^-$. Notice that $\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i+1}\backslash\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i-1}$ and $\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i}\backslash\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i-1}$ will be transformed to K_{3r}^+ and K_r^- under the transformation. To complete the proof, it now remains to show that v satisfies the hypothesis of Corollary 4.2.3. We now take any $\varphi\in\mathrm{C}_Q^2(v;z,\tau)^-$. If we set $\psi(z,\tau)=\varphi(x,t)/M^{\beta k+i-1}$, then we observe that

$$\varphi\in\mathrm{C}_Q^2(v;z,\tau)^-\;\;\Leftrightarrow\;\;\psi\in\mathrm{C}^2_{Q_{3^{j-i}r}(y_0,s_0)}(u;x,t)^-.$$

Now we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{L}}^-v(z,\tau)-\varphi_\tau(z,\tau)&\le\mathcal{L}v(z,\tau)-\varphi_\tau(z,\tau)\\&=\frac{1}{(3^{j-i}r)^\sigma M^{\beta k+i-1}}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mu(u,x,t,y)K(y)\,dy-\psi_t(x,t)\right)\\&=\frac{1}{(3^{j-i}r)^\sigma M^{\beta k+i-1}}\left(\mathcal{L}u(x,t)-\psi_t(x,t)\right)\end{aligned}$$

for any $\mathcal{L}\in\mathfrak{L}$. Since $Q_{3^{j-i}r}(y_0,s_0)\subset Q$, this implies that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{L}}^-v(z,\tau)-\varphi_\tau(z,\tau)\le\frac{1}{(3^{j-i}r)^\sigma M^{\beta k+i-1}}\Big(\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{L}}^-u(x,t)-\psi_t(x,t)\Big)\le\varepsilon_0.$$

Also it is obvious that $v\ge 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, and thus we see from (4.4.5) that $\mathrm{K}_{3r}^+\cap\mathcal{G}_1^v\ne\emptyset$. By Corollary 4.2.3, we obtain that $|\mathcal{G}_M^v\cap\mathrm{K}_r^-|\ge\nu|\mathrm{K}_r^-|$. We note that

$$|\mathcal{G}_M^v\cap\mathrm{K}_r^-|\ge\nu|\mathrm{K}_r^-|\;\;\Leftrightarrow\;\;\left|\mathcal{G}^u_{M^iM^{\beta k}}\cap(\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i}\setminus\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i-1})\right|\ge\nu\left|\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i}\setminus\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i-1}\right|.$$

Since $\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i}\setminus\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i-1}=\mathrm{K}^-_{3^{j-i}r}(y_0,s_0)$, this implies that

$$\left|\mathcal{G}^u_{M^iM^{\beta k}}\cap\tilde{\mathrm{K}}^{j-i}\right|\ge\nu\left|\mathrm{K}^-_{3^{j-i}r}(y_0,s_0)\right|=\nu 3^{(j-i)(n+\sigma)}|\mathrm{K}|.$$

(v) Finally the result follows immediately from (4.4.1) by taking $C=(1-\nu)^{-1}$ and $\varepsilon_*>0$ so that $1-\nu=(M^\beta)^{-\varepsilon_*}$. Hence we complete the proof. □

By a standard covering argument we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 4.4.2. *For any $\sigma_0\in(0,2)$, let $\sigma\in(\sigma_0,2)$ be given. If $u\in\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n\times I)$ is a viscosity supersolution to $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{L}}^-u-u_t\le\varepsilon_0$ with $\sigma\in(\sigma_0,2)$ on Q_2 such that $u\ge 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n\times I$ and $u(0,0)\le 1$ where ε_0 is the constant given in Lemma 4.2.1, then there are universal constants $\mathrm{C}>0$ and $\varepsilon_*>0$ such that*

$$\left|\{u>s\}\cap\mathrm{Q}_1\right|\le C\,s^{-\varepsilon_*}|\mathrm{Q}_1|,\;\forall\,s>0.$$

Theorem 4.4.3. *Given $\sigma_0\in(0,2)$, let $\sigma\in(\sigma_0,2)$, and let $(x_0,t_0)\in\mathbb{R}^n\times I$ and $r\in(0,2]$. If $u\in\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n\times I)$ is a viscosity supersolution to $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{L}}^-u-u_t\le c_0$ on $\mathrm{Q}_{2r}(x_0,t_0)$ such that $u\ge 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n\times I$, then there are universal constants $\varepsilon_*>0$ and $C>0$ such that*

$$\left|\{u>s\}\cap\mathrm{Q}_r(x_0,t_0)\right|\le C\,r^{n+\sigma}\Big(u(x_0,t_0)+c_0\,r^\sigma\Big)^{\varepsilon_*}s^{-\varepsilon_*},\;\forall\,s>0.$$

Proof. Let $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times I$ and set $v(z, \tau) = u(rz + x_0, r^\sigma \tau + t_0)/q$ for $(z, \tau) \in \mathrm{Q}_2$ where $q = u(x_0, t_0) + c_0 r^\sigma/\varepsilon_0$. Take any $\varphi \in \mathrm{C}^2_{\mathrm{Q}_2}(v; z, \tau)^-$. If we set $\psi = q\,\varphi(\frac{\cdot - x_0}{r}, \frac{\cdot - t_0}{r^\sigma})$, then we see that $\psi \in \mathrm{C}^2_{\mathrm{Q}_{2r}(x_0,t_0)}(u; rz + x_0, r^\sigma\tau + t_0)$. Thus by the change of variables $x = rz + x_0$ and $r^\sigma \tau + t_0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v(z,\tau) - \varphi_\tau(z,\tau) &\leq \mathcal{L}v(z,\tau) - \varphi_\tau(z,\tau) \\
&= \frac{r^\sigma}{q}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu(u, rz + x_0, y, r^\sigma\tau + t_0)\, K(y)\, dy - \psi_t(rz + x_0, r^\sigma \tau + t_0)\Big) \\
&:= \frac{r^\sigma}{q}\Big(\mathcal{L}u(x,t) - \psi_t(x,t)\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\mathcal{L} \in \mathfrak{L}_0$. Taking the infimum of the right-hand side in the above inequality, we get that

$$\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v(z,\tau) - \varphi_\tau(z,\tau) \leq \frac{r^\sigma}{q}\Big(\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u(x,t) - \psi_t(x,t)\Big) \leq \varepsilon_0.$$

Thus we have that $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v - \varphi_\tau \leq \varepsilon_0$ on Q_2. Applying Theorem 4.4.2 to the function v, we complete the proof. □

5. Regularity Theory

5.1. **Hölder estimates.** In this subsection, we obtain Hölder regularity result. The following technical lemma is very useful in proving it. As in [CS, KL1], its proof can be derived from Theorem 4.4.3.

In this subsection, we are going to take a notation $\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_r \doteqdot \mathrm{Q}_r \cup Q_r = B_r \times (-r^\sigma, r^\sigma]$ and $\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_r(x_0, t_0) = \bar{\mathrm{Q}}_r + (x_0, t_0)$ for any $r > 0$ and $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times I$.

Lemma 5.1.1. *For $\sigma_0 \in (0, 2)$, let $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$ be given. If u is a bounded function with $|u| \leq 1/2$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \times I$ such that*

$$\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \leq \varepsilon_0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \geq -\varepsilon_0 \ \ \textit{on } \bar{\mathrm{Q}}_2$$

in the viscosity sense where $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ is some sufficiently small constant, then there is some universal constant $\alpha > 0$ (depending only on λ, Λ, n and σ_0) such that $u \in \mathrm{C}^\alpha$ at the origin. More precisely,

$$|u(x,t) - u(0,0)| \leq C\,(|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\alpha/\sigma}$$

for some universal constant $C > 0$ depending only on α.

Lemma 5.1.1 and a simple rescaling argument give the following theorem 4.19 in [W1] and theorems as in [CS, KL1, KL2] .

Theorem 5.1.2. *For any $\sigma_0 \in (0, 2)$, let $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$ be given. If u is a bounded function on $\mathbb{R}^n \times I$ such that*

$$\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \leq C_0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \geq -C_0 \ \ \textit{on } \bar{\mathrm{Q}}_2$$

in the viscosity sense, then there is some constant $\alpha > 0$ (depending only on λ, Λ, n and σ_0) such that

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_{1/2})} \leq C\Big(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)} + C_0\Big)$$

where $C > 0$ *is some universal constant depending only on* α.

Corollary 5.1.3 can be shown by the same way as Theorem 4.4.3.

Corollary 5.1.3. *Given* $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$, *let* $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$, *and let* $(x_0,t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times I$ *and* $r \in (0,2]$. *If* $u \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)$ *is a viscosity supersolution to* $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \le c_0$ *on* $\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_{2r}(x_0,t_0)$ *such that* $u \ge 0$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^n \times I$, *then there are universal constants* $\varepsilon_* > 0$ *and* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\Big|\{u > s\} \cap \bar{\mathrm{Q}}_r(x_0,t_0)\Big| \le C\, r^{n+\sigma}\Big(u(x_0,t_0) + c_0\, r^{\sigma}\Big)^{\varepsilon_*} s^{-\varepsilon_*},\ \forall\, s > 0.$$

[*Proof of Lemma 5.1.1*] We take any $\alpha \in (0,\sigma_0)$ and choose some $N \ge 1$ so large that $2^{1-\sigma_0 N} 2^{-k(\sigma_0-\alpha)N} \le 1/2$ and

$$(5.1.1)\qquad (2-\sigma_0)\Lambda\omega_n\Big(\frac{2^{\sigma_0+1}}{\sigma_0-\alpha}\, 2^{-(N-1)(\sigma_0-\alpha)} + \frac{|\tau_1| \vee \tau_2}{\sigma_0}\, 2^{-(N-1)\sigma_0}\Big) \le \varepsilon_0/2.$$

We may regard u as a function on $\mathbb{R}^n \times (-\infty, \tau_2)$ by setting $u = u\chi_{\mathbb{R}^n\times I}$. Then it is enough to show that there is a nondecreasing sequence $\{n_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}}$ and a nonincreasing sequence $\{N_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}}$ such that $N_k - n_k = 2^{-\alpha k N}$ and $n_k \le u \le N_k$ in $\mathrm{Q}_{2^{-kN}}$. This implies that the theorem holds with $C = 2^{\alpha N}$; for, if $2^{-(k+1)N} \le (|x|^{\sigma} + |t|)^{1/\sigma} \le 2^{-kN}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$, then we have that

$$|u(x,t) - u(0,0)| \le \frac{N_k - n_k}{2^{-\alpha(k+1)N}} \cdot 2^{-\alpha(k+1)N} \le 2^{\alpha N}(|x|^{\sigma} + |t|)^{1/\sigma}.$$

We now construct n_k and N_k by induction process. For $k = 0$, we can take $n_k = \inf_{\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}} u$ and $N_0 = n_0 + 1$ because $\operatorname{osc}_{\mathbb{R}^n\times\mathbb{R}} u \le 1$. We assume that we obtained the sequences up to n_k and N_k for $k \ge 1$. Then we shall show that we can continue the sequences by finding n_{k+1} and N_{k+1}.

Fix any $(x,t) \in \bar{\mathrm{Q}}_{1/\eta}$ where $\eta = 2^{-(k+1)N}$. Take any $\varphi \in \mathrm{C}^2_{\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_{1/\eta}}(v;x,t)^-$ where

$$v = \frac{u(\eta\,\cdot\,, \eta^{\sigma}\cdot\,) - n_k}{(N_k - n_k)/2}.$$

If we set $\psi = n_k + \frac{N_k - n_k}{2}\varphi(\frac{\cdot}{\eta}, \frac{\cdot}{\eta^{\sigma}})$, then we see that $\psi \in \mathrm{C}^2_{\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_1}(u;\eta x, \eta^{\sigma} t)^-$.

In $\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_{2^{-(k+1)N}}$, we have two possible cases; either (a) $u > (N_k + n_k)/2$ in at least half of the points (in measure) or (b) $u \le (N_k + n_k)/2$ in at least half of the points. First, we deal with the case (a)

$$|\{u > (N_k + n_k)/2\} \cap \bar{\mathrm{Q}}_{2^{-(k+1)N}}| \ge |\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_{2^{-(k+1)N}}|/2.$$

Then we see that $v \ge 0$ on $\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_{2^N}$ and $|\{v > 1\} \cap \bar{\mathrm{Q}}_1| \ge |\bar{\mathrm{Q}}_1|/2$. We observe that the mapping $\mathcal{K}_0 \mapsto \mathcal{K}_0$ given by $K \to K_\eta$ is an isometry. Thus by the change of variables we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v(x,t) - v_t(x,t) &\le \mathcal{L}v(x,t) - v_t(x,t)\\ &= \frac{2\eta^{\sigma}}{N_k - n_k}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu(u,\eta x, \eta^{\sigma} t) K_\eta(y,t)\,dy - u_t(\eta x, \eta^{\sigma} t)\Big)\end{aligned}$$

for any $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$. Taking the infimum on $\mathfrak{L}$ of the right-hand side in the above inequality and using the assumption that $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \leq \varepsilon_0$ on $\bar{Q}_2$ in the viscosity sense, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v(x,t) - v_t(x,t) &\leq \frac{2\eta^\sigma}{N_k - n_k}\Big(\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u(\eta x, \eta^\sigma t) - u_t(\eta x, \eta^\sigma t)\Big)\\ &\leq 2^{1-\sigma_0 N} 2^{-k(\sigma_0-\alpha)N} \varepsilon_0 \leq \varepsilon_0/2.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v - v_t \leq \varepsilon_0/2 \ \text{ on } \bar{Q}_{2^{(k+1)N}}. \tag{5.1.2}$$

By the induction hypothesis, if $2^{jN} \leq (|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{1/\sigma} \leq 2^{(j+1)N}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} v(x,t) &\geq \frac{n_{k-j} - N_{k-j} + N_k - n_k}{(N_k - n_k)/2} \geq -2(|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\alpha/\sigma},\\ v(x,t) &\leq \frac{N_{k-j} - n_{k-j} + n_{k-j} - n_k}{(N_k - n_k)/2} \leq 2(|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\alpha/\sigma}\end{aligned} \tag{5.1.3}$$

for any $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. This implies that $|v(x,t)| \leq 2(|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\alpha/\sigma}$ outside $\bar{Q}_1$.

Set $w(x,t) = \max\{v(x,t), 0\}$.We are going to show that $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} w - w_t \leq 4\varepsilon_0$ on $\bar{Q}_{2^{N-1}}$. Notice that if $(x,t) \in \bar{Q}_{2^{N-1}}$ and $y \in B_{2^{N-1}}$, then $\mu(v^-, x, y, t) = 0$ because $v \geq 0$ on $\bar{Q}_{2^N}$; if $(x,t) \in \bar{Q}_{2^{N-1}}$ and $y \in B^c_{2^{N-1}}$, then $\mu(v^-, x, y, t) = v^-(x+y, t)$ because $v \geq 0$ on $\bar{Q}_{2^N}$. Since $w = v + v^-$, then we see that $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} w - w_t \leq \mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v - v_t + \mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} v^- - v^-_t$. Thus it follows from (5.1.1) and (5.1.3) that if $(x,t) \in \bar{Q}_{2^{N-1}}$ is given, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} v^-(x,t) &\leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu(v^-, x, y, t) K(y,t)\, dy\\ &\leq (2-\sigma)\Lambda \int_{|y| \geq 2^{N-1}} \frac{2(|x+y|^\sigma + |t|)^{\alpha/\sigma}}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\, dy\\ &\leq (2-\sigma_0)\Lambda\Big(\int_{|y| \geq 2^{N-1}} \frac{2^{\alpha(1+1/\sigma)}}{|y|^{n+\sigma_0-\alpha}} dy + \int_{|y| \geq 2^{N-1}} \frac{(|\tau_1| \vee \tau_2)^{\alpha/\sigma}}{|y|^{n+\sigma_0}}\Big)\\ &\leq (2-\sigma_0)\Lambda\omega_n\Big(\frac{2^{\sigma_0+1}}{\sigma_0-\alpha} 2^{-(N-1)(\sigma_0-\alpha)} + \frac{|\tau_1| \vee \tau_2}{\sigma_0} 2^{-(N-1)\sigma_0}\Big)\\ &\leq \varepsilon_0/2\end{aligned}$$

for any $\mathcal{L} \in \mathfrak{L}$, whenever $\alpha \in (0, \sigma_0)$ and $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$. Since $v^-_t(x,t) = 0$ for any $(x,t) \in \bar{Q}_{2^{N-1}}$, we have that $\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} v^- - v^-_t \leq \varepsilon_0/2$ on $\bar{Q}_{2^{N-1}}$. Thus by (5.1.2) we conclude that $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} w - w_t \leq \varepsilon_0$ on $\bar{Q}_{2^{N-1}}$ where $\alpha \in (0, \sigma_0)$.

We now take any point $(x,t) \in \bar{Q}_1$. Since $\bar{Q}_1 \subset \bar{Q}_2(x,t) \subset \bar{Q}_4(x,t) \subset \bar{Q}_{2^{N-1}}$, we can apply Corollary 5.1.3 on $\bar{Q}_2(x,t)$ to obtain that

$$2^{n+\sigma} C\Big(w(x,t) + 2^\sigma \varepsilon_0\Big)^{\varepsilon_*} \geq |\{w > 1\} \cap \bar{Q}_2(x,t)| \geq |\{v > 1\} \cap \bar{Q}_1| \geq \frac{1}{2}|\bar{Q}_1|.$$

Thus we have that

$$w(x,t) \geq \left(\frac{|\bar{Q}_1|}{2^{n+\sigma+1}C}\right)^{1/\varepsilon_*} - 4\varepsilon_0$$

for any $(x,t) \in \bar{Q}_1$. If we select ε_0 sufficiently small, then there is some $\kappa > 0$ such that $w \geq \kappa$ on $\bar{Q}_1$. If we take $N_{k+1} = N_k$ and $n_{k+1} = n_k + \kappa(N_k - n_k)/2$, then we have that $n_{k+1} \leq u \leq N_{k+1}$ on $\bar{Q}_{2^{-(k+1)N}}$. Furthermore, we have that $N_{k+1} - n_{k+1} = (1 - \kappa/2)2^{-\alpha kN}$. Now we may choose some small $\alpha > 0$ and $\kappa > 0$ so that $1 - \kappa/2 = 2^{-\alpha N}$. Hence we obtain that $N_{k+1} - n_{k+1} = 2^{-\alpha(k+1)N}$.

On the other hand, if we treat of the second case (b)

$$|\{u \leq (N_k + n_k)/2\} \cap \bar{Q}_{2^{-(k+1)N}}| \geq |\bar{Q}_{2^{-(k+1)N}}|/2,$$

then we consider the function $v(x,t) = \dfrac{N_k - u(2^{-(k+1)N}x, 2^{-\alpha(k+1)N}t)}{(N_k - n_k)/2}$ and repeat the same way as in the above by using $\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \geq -\varepsilon_0$. □

5.2. $C^{1,\alpha}$**-estimates.** In this subsection, we establish an interior $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity result for viscosity solutions as [CS]. We now consider the class $\mathfrak{L}^1$ consisting of the operators $\mathcal{L} \in \mathfrak{L}$ associated with kernel K for which (1.1.2) holds and there exists some $\eta_1 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{t\in I}\sup_{h\in B_{\eta_1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_{2\eta_1}} \frac{|K(y,t) - K(y-h,t)|}{|h|}\, dy \leq C. \tag{5.2.1}$$

Theorem 5.2.1. *For $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$, let $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$ be given. Then there is some $\eta_1 > 0$ (depending on $\lambda, \Lambda, \sigma_0$ and the dimension n) so that if $\mathcal{I}$ is a nonlocal elliptic operator with respect to $\mathfrak{L}^1$ in the sense of Definition 1.1.1 and $u \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)$ is a viscosity solution to $u_t = \mathcal{I}u$ on $\bar{Q}_2$, then there is a universal constant $\alpha > 0$ (depending only on $\lambda, \Lambda, \sigma_0$ and the dimension n) such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{Q}_{1/2})} \leq C\Big(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times I)} + |\mathcal{I}0|\Big)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending on $\lambda, \Lambda, \sigma_0, n$ and the constant given in (5.2.1) *(where we denote by $\mathcal{I}0$ the value we obtain when we apply $\mathcal{I}$ with $0 < \sigma < 2$ to the constant function that is equal to zero).*

Proof. Since $u_t = \mathcal{I}u$ on $\bar{Q}_2$, by Definition 1.1.1 we have that $\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u \geq \mathcal{I}u - \mathcal{I}0 = u_t - \mathcal{I}0 \geq u_t - |\mathcal{I}0|$, and so $\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \geq -|\mathcal{I}0|$ on $\bar{Q}_2$. Similarly we have that $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \leq |\mathcal{I}0|$ on $\bar{Q}_2$. Thus it follows from Theorem 5.1.2 that $u \in C^\alpha(\bar{Q}_{1-\delta})$ for any $\delta \in (0,1)$ and $\|u\|_{C^\alpha(\bar{Q}_{1-\delta})} \leq C(\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n\times I)} + |\mathcal{I}0|)$. Now we will try to improve the obtained regularity iteratively by applying Theorem 5.1.2 again until we reach Lipschitz regularity in a finite number of steps.

Assume that we have shown that $u \in C^\beta(\bar{Q}_r)$ for some $\beta \in (0,1]$ and $r \in (0,1)$. Then we apply Theorem 5.1.2 to the difference quotient $u^h = (\tau_h u - u)/|h|^\beta$ where τ_h is a translation operator in space variable given by $\tau_h u(x,t) = u(x+h,t)$ for $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in I$. Since we see from Theorem 2.0.4 that $\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u^h - u^h_t \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u^h - u^h_t \leq 0$ on $\bar{Q}_r$ (in the viscosity sense) for any

h with $|h| \in (0, 1-r)$, it follows from Theorem 5.1.2 that $u^h \in C^{\beta}(\bar{Q}_r)$ and the family $\{u^h\}_{|h| \in (0,1-r)}$ is uniformly bounded on $\bar{Q}_r$ with bound $C\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)}$. However the functions u^h is not uniformly bounded outside the ball $\bar{Q}_r$, and thus we can not directly apply Theorem 5.1.2. But we have a nice tool (5.2.1) to overcome this obstacle. For this purpose, we employ a smooth cutoff function ϕ supported in $\bar{Q}_r$ such that $\phi \equiv 1$ in $\bar{Q}_{r-\delta/4}$ where $\delta > 0$ is some small positive number to be determined later. We write $u^h = v^h + w^h$ where $v^h = \phi\, u^h$ and $w^h = (1-\phi)u^h$.

Take any $(x,t) \in \bar{Q}_{r-\delta/2}$ and $|h| < \delta/16$. Then we see $(1-\phi(x,t))u(x,t) = (1-\phi(x,t))\tau_h u(x,t) = 0$ and $u^h(x,t) = v^h(x,t)$. We shall now prove $v^h \in C^{\alpha+\beta}(\bar{Q}_{r-\delta})$ for some $\alpha > 0$ with $\alpha + \beta > 1$. From Definition 1.1.1, we can derive the following inequalities;

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} v^h - v_t &\geq -\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}^1} w^h + w_t - \mathcal{I}0 = -\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}^1} w^h - \mathcal{I}0, \\ \mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v^h - v_t &\leq -\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}^1} w^h + w_t - \mathcal{I}0 = -\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}^1} w^h - \mathcal{I}0 \end{aligned} \tag{5.2.2}$$

on $\bar{Q}_{r-\delta/2}$, because $w_t \equiv 0$ on $\bar{Q}_{r-\delta/2}$. In order to apply Theorem 5.1.2, we must show that $|\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}^1} w^h|$ and $|\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}^1} w^h|$ are bounded on $\bar{Q}_{r-\delta/2}$ by $C\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)}$ for some universal constant $C > 0$. To show this, we have only to prove that it is true for any operator $\mathcal{L} \in \mathfrak{L}^1$. Take any $\mathcal{L} \in \mathfrak{L}^1$. Since $w_t \equiv 0$ on $\bar{Q}_{r-\delta/2}$,the conclusion comes from the argument on the elliptic case as [CS] □

5.3. **Harnack inequality.** Now we are going to show Harnack inequality .

Theorem 5.3.1. *Given* $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$, *let* $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$. *If* $u \in B(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)$ *is a positive function such that*

$$\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \leq C_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \geq -C_0 \quad \text{on } Q_2$$

in the viscosity sense, then there is some constant $C > 0$ *depending only on* λ, Λ, n , σ_0, $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)}$ *such that*

$$\sup_{Q^-_{1/2}} u \leq C\Big(\inf_{Q^+_{1/2}} u + C_0\Big).$$

Proof. Let $(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) \in Q^+_{1/2}$ be a point so that $\inf_{Q^+_{1/2}} u = u(\hat{x}, \hat{t})$. Then it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{Q^-_{1/2}} u \leq C\Big(u(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) + C_0\Big).$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) \leq 1$ and $C_0 = 1$ by dividing u by $u(\hat{x}, \hat{t}) + C_0$. Let $\varepsilon_* > 0$ be the number given in Theorem 4.4.3 and let $\beta = (n+\sigma)/\varepsilon_*$. We now set $s_0 = \inf\{s > 0 : u(x,t) \leq s\, d((x,t), \partial Q_1)^{-\beta},\ \forall\, (x,t) \in Q_1\}$. Then we see that $s_0 > 0$ because u is positive on $\mathbb{R}^n \times I$. Also there is some $(\check{x}, \check{t}) \in Q_1$ such that $u(\check{x}, \check{t}) = s_0\, d((\check{x}, \check{t}), \partial Q_1))^{-\beta} = s_0 d_0^{-\beta}$ where $d_0 = d((\check{x}, \check{t}), \partial Q_1) \leq 2^{1/\sigma} < 2$ for $\sigma \in (1,2)$. We note that

$$B^d_r(x_0, t_0) \subset Q_r(x_0, t_0) \subset B^d_{2r}(x_0, t_0) \tag{5.3.1}$$

for any $r > 0$ and $(x_0, t_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times I$.

To finish the proof, we have only to show that s_0 can not be too large because $u(x,t) \leq C_1 \mathrm{d}((x,t), \partial \mathrm{Q}_1)^{-\beta} \leq C$ for any $x \in \mathrm{Q}^-_{1/2} \subset \mathrm{Q}_1$ if $C_1 > 0$ is some constant with $s_0 \leq C_1$. Assume that s_0 is very large. Then by Theorem 4.4.2 we have that

$$\left|\{u \geq u(\check{x}, \check{t})/2\} \cap \mathrm{Q}_1\}\right| \leq \left|\frac{2}{u(\check{x}, \check{t})}\right|^{\varepsilon_*} |\mathrm{Q}_1| \leq C s_0^{-\varepsilon_*} \mathrm{d}_0^{n+\sigma}.$$

Since $\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_r(\check{x}, \check{t}) \subset \mathrm{Q}_1$ and $|\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_r| = C \mathrm{d}_0^{n+\sigma}$ for $r = \mathrm{d}_0/2 \leq 2^{-(1-1/\sigma)} < 1$ for $\sigma \in (1,2)$, we easily obtain that

$$\left|\{u \geq u(x_0, t_0)/2\} \cap \mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_r(\check{x}, \check{t})\}\right| \leq \left|\frac{2}{u(\check{x}, \check{t})}\right|^{\varepsilon_*} \leq C s_0^{-\varepsilon_*} |\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_r|. \tag{5.3.2}$$

In order to get a contradiction, we estimate $|\{u \leq u(\check{x}, \check{t})/2\} \cap \mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}(\check{x}, \check{t})|$ for some very small $\delta > 0$ (to be determined later). For any $(x,t) \in \mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{2\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$, we have that $u(x,t) \leq s_0(\mathrm{d}_0 - \delta \mathrm{d}_0)^{-\beta} = u(\check{x}, \check{t})(1-\delta)^{-\beta}$ for $\delta > 0$ so that $(1-\delta)^{-\beta}$ is close to 1. We consider the function

$$v(x,t) = (1-\delta)^{-\beta} u(\check{x}, \check{t}) - u(x,t).$$

Then we see that $v \geq 0$ on $\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{2\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$, and also $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v - v_t \leq 1$ on $Q_{\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$ because $\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} u - u_t \geq -1$ on $Q_{\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$. We now want to apply Theorem 4.4.3 to v. However v is not positive on $\mathbb{R}^n$ but only on $Q_{\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$. To apply Theorem 4.4.3, we consider $w = v^+$ instead of v. Since $w = v + v^-$, we have that $\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} w - w_t \leq \mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v - v_t + \mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} v^- - v^-_t \leq 1 + \mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} v^- - v^-_t$ on $Q_{\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$. Since $v^- \equiv 0$ on $\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{2\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$, if $(x,t) \in Q_{\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$ then we have that $\mu(v^-, x, y, t) = v^-(x+y, t) + v^-(x-y, t)$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Take any $(x,t) \in Q_{\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$ and any $\varphi \in \mathrm{C}^2_{Q_{\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})}(v^-; x, t)^+$. Since $(x,t) + B_{\delta r} \subset Q_{2\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$ and $v^-(x,t) = 0$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} v^-(x,t) - v^-_t(x,t) &= (2-\sigma) \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\Lambda \mu^+(v^-, x, y, t) - \lambda \mu^-(v^-, x, y, t)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}} \, dy \\
&\leq (2-\sigma) \Lambda \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)} \int_{\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : v(x+y,t) < 0\}} \frac{1}{|y|^{n+\sigma}} \, dy \\
&\leq (2-\sigma) \Lambda \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)} \int_{B^c_{\delta r}} \frac{1}{|y|^{n+\sigma}} \, dy \\
&\leq C \frac{(2-\sigma) \Lambda \|u\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \times I)}}{(\delta r)^{n+\sigma}}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain that w satisfies

$$\mathcal{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} w(x,t) - w_t \leq C (\delta r)^{-\sigma} \quad \text{on } Q_{\delta r}(\check{x}, \check{t})$$

in viscosity sense. Since $u(\check{x},\check{t}) = s_0\mathrm{d}_0^{-\beta} = 2^{-\beta}s_0r^{-\beta}$ and $\beta\varepsilon_* = \sigma$, applying Theorem 4.4.3 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\{u \le u(\check{x},\check{t})/2\} \cap \mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}(\check{x},\check{t})\right| &\le \left|\{u \le u(\check{x},\check{t})/2\} \cap Q_{\delta r/2}(\check{x},\check{t})\right|\\ &= \left|\{w \ge u(\check{x},\check{t})((1-\delta)^{-\beta} - 1/2)\} \cap Q_{\delta r/2}(\check{x},\check{t})\right|\\ &\le C(\delta r)^{n+\sigma}\Big[((1-\delta)^{-\beta} - 1)u(\check{x},\check{t}) + C(\delta r)^{-\sigma}(\delta r)^{\sigma}\Big]^{\varepsilon_*}\\ &\qquad\qquad \times \Big[u(\check{x},\check{t})((1-\delta)^{-\beta} - 1/2)\Big]^{-\varepsilon_*}\\ &\le C(\delta r)^{n+\sigma}\Big[((1-\delta)^{-\beta} - 1)^{\varepsilon_*} + \delta^{-n\varepsilon_*}s_0^{-\varepsilon_*}\Big].\end{aligned}$$

We now choose $\delta > 0$ so small enough that $C(\delta r)^{n+\sigma}((1-\delta)^{-\beta}-1)^{\varepsilon_*} \le |\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}|/4$. Since δ was chosen independently of s_0, if s_0 is large enough for such fixed δ then we get that $C(\delta r)^{n+\sigma}\delta^{-n\varepsilon_*}s_0^{-\varepsilon_*} \le |\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}|/4$. Therefore we obtain that $\left|\{u \le u(\check{x},\check{t})/2\} \cap \mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}(\check{x},\check{t})\right| \le |\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}|/2$. Thus we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\{u \ge u(\check{x},\check{t})/2\} \cap \mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{r}(\check{x},\check{t})\right| &\ge \left|\{u \ge u(\check{x},\check{t})/2\} \cap \mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}(\check{x},\check{t})\right|\\ &\ge \left|\{u > u(\check{x},\check{t})/2\} \cap \mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}(\check{x},\check{t})\right|\\ &\ge \left|\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}(\check{x},\check{t})\right| - \left|\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}\right|/2\\ &= \left|\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{\delta r/2}\right|/2 = C|\mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{d}}_{r}|,\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (5.3.2) if s_0 is large enough. Thus we complete the proof.

□

Acknowledgement. Ki-Ahm Lee was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MEST)(2010-0001985).

REFERENCES

[A] Sayah Awatif, *Équations d'Hamilton-Jacobi du premier ordre avec termes intégro-différentiels. I Unicité des solutions de viscosité,* Comm. Partial Differential Equations **16**(6-7), 1991, 1057–1074.

[BI] Guy Barles and Cyril Imbert, *Second-order elliptic integro-differential equations: Viscosity solutions' theory revisited*, Preprint.

[BBC] Martin T. Barlow; Richard F. Bass; Zhen-Qing Chen; Moritz Kassmann, *Non-local Dirichlet forms and symmetric jump processes,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **361**, 2009, no. 4, 1963–1999.

[BK1] Richard F. Bass and Moritz Kassmann, *Harnack inequalities for non-local operators of variable order,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **357**(2), 2005, 837–850.

[BK2] Richard F. Bass and Moritz Kassmann, *Hölder continuity of harmonic functions with respect to operators of variable order,* Comm. Partial Differential Equations **30**(7-9), 2005, 1249–1259.

[BL] Richard F. Bass and David A. Levin, *Harnack inequalities for jump processes,* Potential Anal. **17**(4), 2002, 375–388.

[C] Luis A. Caffarelli, *Interior a priori estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear equations,* Ann. of Math. (2) **130**(1), 1989, 189–213.

[CV] L. Caffarelli, Alexis Vasseur, *Drift diffusion equations with fractional diffusion and the quasi-geometrophic equation* to appear in Annals of math.

[CS] Luis A. Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre, *Regularity theory for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **62**(5), 2009, 597–638.

[CC] Luis A. Caffarelli and Xavier Cabré, *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations,* volume 43 of American Mathematical Society, Colloquium Publications. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995.

[CS] Luis A. Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre, *Regularity theory for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **62**(5), 2009, 597–638.

[D] G. Dong, *Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations of Second Order,* Translations of mathematical monographs, vol **95**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1991.

[GT] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, Second edition.* Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 224. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983. xiii+513 pp.

[GD] E. De Giorgi and G. Dal Maso, Γ*-convergence and calculus of variations,* Lecture notes in Mathematics **979**, 1983, Springer-Verlag.

[I] Hitoshi Ishii, *On uniqueness and existence of viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second-order elliptic PDEs,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **42**(1), 1989, 15–45.

[J] Robert Jensen, *The maximum principle for viscosity solutions of fully nonlinear second order partial differential equations,* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **101**(1), 1988, 1–27.

[KL1] Yong-Cheol Kim and Ki-Ahm Lee, *Regularity results for fully nonlinear integro-differential operators with nonsymmetric positive kernels : Subcritical Case,* submitted

[KL2] Yong-Cheol Kim and Ki-Ahm Lee, *Regularity results for fully nonlinear integro-differential operators with nonsymmetric positive kernels,* submitted

[KS] N. V. Krylov and M. V. Safonov, *An estimate for the probability of a diffusion process hitting a set of positive measure,* Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR **245**, 1979, 18–20.

[S] Luis Silvestre, *Hölder estimates for solutions of integro-differential equations like the fractional laplace,* Indiana Univ. Math. Jour. **55**(3), 2006, 1155–1174.

[So] Halil Mete Soner, *Optimal control with state-space constraint. II,* SIAM J. Control Optim. **24**(6), 1986, 1110–1122.

[SV] Renming Song and Zoran Vondraček, *Harnack inequality for some classes of Markov processes,* Math. Z. **246**(1-2), 2004, 177–202.

[T] K. Tso, *Deforming a hypersurface by its gauss-Kronecker curvature*, Comm. Pure appl. Math. **38** (1985), 867–882.

[W1] Wang, Lihe *On the regularity theory of fully nonlinear parabolic equations. I.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **45** (1992), no. 1, 2776.

• Yong-Cheol Kim : Department of Mathematics Education, Korea University, Seoul 136-701, Korea
E-mail address: `ychkim@korea.ac.kr`

• Ki-Ahm Lee : Department of Mathematics, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-747, Korea
E-mail address: `kiahm@math.snu.ac.kr`